

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 075 902

EA 004 909

TITLE Four-Quarter Extended Year Program. Second Evaluation Report: Park Elementary School.
INSTITUTION Hayward Unified School District, Calif.
PUB DATE May 72
NOTE 71p.
EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.65 HC-\$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Achievement Rating; *Comparative Analysis; Educational Research; Elementary Schools; *Extended School Year; Family School Relationship; Parent Participation; *Program Development; *Program Evaluation; *Quarter System; Questionnaires; Reading Improvement; Tables (Data); Testing
IDENTIFIERS California; Hayward School District; Park Elementary School

ABSTRACT

This report represents a research design oriented toward a descriptive and analytical treatment of selected data pertaining to the development, operation, and evaluation of the Park Four-Quarter Plan; covers a 3-year period (the school years 1969-70, 70-71, and 71-72); and gives a brief background covering the development of the program. Study findings reveal that, for the most part, parents, teachers, students, and administrators rate the program as excellent; that the program provides more opportunities for parent participation in school activities; and that better student-teacher-parent relationships have resulted. The document content is divided into (1) background information; (2) analysis of survey questionnaire data; (3) report of test results (Park Elementary School); and (4) general summary, conclusions, and recommendations. (Author)

ED 075902

HAYWARD UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

second

Evaluation Report

Park Elementary School

SCHOOL
YEARS



1969 - 70



1970 - 71



1971 - 72

EA 001 909

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

*Four - Quarter
Extended Year
Program*

Dr. Raymond G. Arveson, Superintendent
1099 E Street, Hayward, California 94541

May, 1972

BOARD OF EDUCATION

Arnold Biella, Ph. D.
Gregory Michaels
Philip Silver
Mrs. Dolores Wagner
Marvin S. Weinreb, M.D.

ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF

Raymond G. Arveson, Ed. D., Superintendent
Eric V. Hawkinson, Assistant Superintendent, Educational Services
H. Marshall Hansen, Business Manager
Miss Joan Chambers, Director of Pupil Personnel Services
Robert H. Cochrane, Director of Certificated Personnel
Donald W. Oakes, Director of Secondary Education
Wayne L. Sorenson, Ed. D., Director of Research and Federal Projects
Robert H. Williams, Director of Elementary Education

PARTICIPATING SCHOOL

Bernard P. Moura, Principal
Park Elementary School

*
*
*
*
*
*
*

HAYWARD UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
1099 E. Street
Hayward, California 94541

May 1972

PREFACE

This evaluation report represents the efforts and contributions of many individuals and groups who have given support and encouragement to the operation of the Park Four-Quarter Extended Year Program.

Special acknowledgment of the cooperation and assistance of the following groups who made a contribution to this report is given below:

- o the secretaries and clerk-typists
- o the teaching and administrative staff of Park School
- o representatives from the California State Department of Education and specifically the Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education
- o representatives of the California State Legislature, especially Carlos Bee, Assemblyman, 13th District, who sponsored enabling legislation for the year-around school
- o the parents and pupils of Park School for their assistance in completing the questionnaires
- o the central office staff of the Hayward Unified School District and the Publications Department

It is hoped that this report will give additional insight into some of the existing and challenging aspects of the extended year concept. The near-continuous twelve-month utilization of education resources (facility, site, and staff) offers many challenges and some problems as the educational profession develops a comprehensive sequential instructional program for students.

Dr. Raymond G. Arveson, Superintendent
Hayward Unified School District

A NOTE TO THE READERS OF THIS REPORT

The following information is given as an aid to the readers of this evaluation report. The report-----

- o represents a research design which is oriented toward a descriptive and analytical treatment of selected data pertaining to the development, the operation, and evaluation of the Park Four-Quarter Plan.
- o covers a three-year period which includes the school years 1969-70, 1970-71, and 1971-72.
- o gives a brief background covering the development of this program.

As more information is collected and analyzed, refined evaluation strategies and techniques will be developed which will more adequately represent the complexity of assessing the following concepts relative to the extended year program:

- o non-graded classrooms and continuous progress plans
- o utilization of facilities
- o financial constraints and cost accounting for the program variables inherent in a four-quarter plan
- o loss of learning the often hypothesized "regression" factor on children. (Do pupils lose skill and concept mastery as a result of the three-month vacation period in the summer?).
- o follow-up studies of the Park Four-Quarter participants
- o pupil, staff, and parent attitudes concerning the effectiveness of the Park plan
- o pupil motivation and self-direction
- o effects of individualized instruction and multi-age grouping

It will be noted that the report is divided into four major parts or sections. Each section is numbered separately and contains information directly related to that section.

The development of the evaluation report was the major responsibility of the Department of Research and the Department of Elementary Education, cooperating with the staff at Park Elementary School.

Wayne L. Sorenson, Director
Research and Federal Projects

Robert H. Williams, Director
Elementary Education

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE	i
A NOTE TO READERS OF THIS REPORT	ii
PART I SOME BACKGROUND INFORMATION	1
Purposes of the Report	1
Development of the Four-Quarter Extended School Year	1-6
PART II ANALYSIS OF RESULTS OF SURVEYS AND QUESTIONNAIRES	1
Certificated Staff Members at Park School and Comments	2-12
Random Sampling of District K-6 Teachers Not at Park School and Comments	13-15b
District K-6 Principal Survey - Comparison of Results (School Years 1969 and 1972)	16-18
Park School Parent Survey and Questionnaire and Comments	19-25
Pupil Survey and Questionnaire (Upper Elementary - Grades 4,5,and 6) and Comments	26-28
PART III A REPORT OF TEST RESULTS, PARK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	1
Overview	1
Scores Being Reported	1
Comparison Groups	1
Table I- CTBS Test Results, November, 1969	2
Table II- CTBS Test Results, November, 1970	3
Table III- CTBS Test Results, October, 1971	4
Table IIIa-Park School Net Gains, Grade 4-6, November, 1969 and October, 1971 and Summary	4a-4b
Table IV- Park School Grade Equivalent Scores at the Median (50th Percentile) Grades 1 and 2 in the Cooperative Primary Reading Test 12A and 23A	5
Table V- Park School Grade Equivalent Scores at the Median, (50th Percentile) Grades 2 and 3 in the Cooperative Primary Reading Test 23A and 23B	6
Table VI- Park School Net Reading Gains, Grades 1-3 May, 1970 and May, 1972	7
Table VII- Comparative Report of Minimum Standard Test in Reading and Mathematics (8th Grade Students at Winton Junior High School)	8
Analysis of Table VII	9

PART IV GENERAL SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

SUMMARY

School and Community Liaison	1
Pupil Mobility at Park School	2
Financing the Extended School Year	3
Other Information	4

CONCLUSIONS	5
-------------	---

RECOMMENDATIONS	6
-----------------	---

APPENDICES

Appendix A:	California Education Code, Section 7495.32
Appendix B:	Park School Four-Quarter Calendar, 1971-72
Appendix C:	Selected Elementary Schools to Serve as Comparison Groups for Park School Evaluation Report (School Years 1969-70, 1970-71, and 1971-72)
Appendix D:	Certificated and Classified Staff - Park Elementary School, 1970-71

PART I - SOME BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Purposes of the Evaluation Report

The information compiled in this report serves as a basis for submitting information to the following groups:

- o the Board of Education, Hayward Unified School District
- o the California Legislature which mandates, through the provisions of California Education Code, Section 7495.32 that a periodic comprehensive report be made of the progress of the Park Four-Quarter Plan. (see Appendix A)
- o the patrons of the Park Elementary School and other community groups
- o staff members of Park Elementary School
- o teacher and administrative organizations
- o other interested individuals and groups who have been following the development of the Park Four-Quarter Plan since its inception in 1967

The Hayward Community

Hayward, California is a community of approximately 100,000 population located in the East Bay of the San Francisco Bay Area. It is a suburban middle socioeconomic community that is essentially a "bedroom community". Most of the people who live in Hayward work in industries and service occupations outside the Hayward area; however, during the past five years, a retail and industrial growth has taken place which provides greater opportunities for employment in the area.

Development of the Four-Quarter Extended School Year

Hayward Unified School District has operated a compulsory year-around schedule in Park Elementary School since 1968. This innovative program followed a series of investigations and legislative actions. Upon completion of the first year of the four-quarter school, a study was completed to determine the results of the experience. The study indicated positive results in the areas of improved reading and mathematics test scores, as well as continued positive support by the community. The results of the study indicated a need for a continuance of the study for an additional five years.

PART I - SOME BACKGROUND INFORMATION (Continued)

Early Development

The four-quarter plan was originally conceived and developed by two principals within the District, Dr. Daniel A. Foster and Mr. Bernard P. Moura. Through cooperation with central office personnel and teachers, application was made for ESEA, Title III funding for a four-quarter feasibility study.

ESEA TITLE III Project

During the summer of 1967, the District received a Title III ESEA grant to study a year-around school. The proposed plan was for a compulsory four-quarter school year. The grant totaled \$31,403 and covered the period of time from September 1, 1967 to January 31, 1969.

Mr. Allan J. Petersdorf, currently Superintendent of the Monterey Peninsula School District, then Director of Elementary Education in Hayward, was appointed director; and Mr. Bernard Moura, Principal of Park School, was appointed coordinator of the project. During the school year 1968-69, Allan Petersdorf was appointed Assistant Superintendent and the new Director of Elementary Education, Mr. Robert Williams, was appointed as director of the program.

A continuation grant in the amount of \$29,538 was awarded on February 13, 1969, covering the period February 1, 1969 to August 31, 1969. Since August, 1969, the program has been financed by state and local funds. The State apportions a.d.a. monies for the additional time over the regular session.

Feasibility Study

Extensive planning and development of inservice with the Park School staff was coordinated and directed by Mr. Allan Petersdorf and Mr. Bernard Moura throughout the 1967-68 school year.

The feasibility study and continuing program seek some solutions to one of education's most pressing and most significant unsolved problems -- that of giving more flexibility in the organization of the school year. The District feels this plan will provide greater educational opportunities for many students as follows:

- o a longer instructional year to help alleviate a crowded school curriculum
- o better opportunities for students to develop their individual potential
- o better utilization of school facilities
- o greater opportunities to plan vacation schedules during different seasons of the year

PART I - SOME BACKGROUND INFORMATION (Continued)

Feasibility Study (Continued)

- o a shorter vacation period at more frequent intervals to reduce loss of learning, student fatigue and teacher fatigue, and to provide better learning experiences for the students
- o greater in-depth instruction by offering fewer subjects during each day
- o opportunity and a time for teachers to plan for the next quarter
- o opportunity for closer communication and cooperation between parents and the school
- o closer relationship with the growing four-quarter organizational pattern being employed by institutions of higher learning, and an opportunity for optimum use of student teachers in the classrooms of the District.

Community Surveys

Along with parent informational meetings, two written surveys were conducted to assess parents' support. Eighty percent of the school community approved of the program and indicated they would enroll their children, ten percent did not approve of the program, but indicated they would enroll their children if the program was presented. Even though ten percent did not approve of the four-quarter system and indicated they would not enroll their children in the school, all but three children were enrolled. A third survey conducted by a local newspaper verified surveys made by the District. Additional surveys were conducted to determine the feasibility of the year-around school.

Legislative Action

Assemblyman Carlos Bee, of the 13th District, introduced enabling legislation to allow the District to participate in a two-year pilot venture. Assembly Bill 1971 was passed by the California State Legislature and was signed by Governor Ronald Reagan on August 6, 1968. (State of California Education Code Section-7495.11 - 7495.14).

In 1970, Assemblyman Bee introduced Assembly Bill 1691 to allow for an additional five years of operation. Following legislative approval, the bill was signed into law allowing the year-around program to continue through the 1974-75 school year.

PART I - SOME BACKGROUND INFORMATION (Continued)

Calendar

The school year consists of four quarters of approximately fifty days each with three weeks between quarters. One week of each break is devoted to parent conferences, teacher inservice, and planning. Teachers have two weeks' vacation while students have the full three weeks off between quarters. The District's Christmas and Spring vacations coincide with the three-week quarter breaks. (See Appendix B, Park School Four-Quarter Calendar, 1971-72).

Educational Organization

The Park School program is designed to encourage the continuous progress plan of education and individualized instruction. The school is organized in three levels: lower elementary, middle elementary, and upper elementary. The intention of the year-around school is program enrichment and to allow each child to progress at his own rate both horizontally and vertically, but not to accelerate a student through the grades to enter junior high school at an earlier age. The total additional time in school during the seven years, kindergarten through six, will amount to approximately one year. This additional year will allow for greater flexibility in curriculum offerings.

Formal parent conferences have been taking the place of the traditional report cards. Parent conferences are held three times a year during the quarter breaks and informal conferences may be held any time at the request of the parent or teacher.

Staffing and Inservice Education

Since it is a year-around program, teachers are allowed to volunteer for assignment to Park School. All staff members are placed on the regular District salary schedule and are compensated for the extended work year on a prorated basis.

As one of its main resources for inservice training and program development, the District uses the services of California State College at Hayward. Extension Division classes are held at Park School on individualized instruction. Inservice meetings are conducted by the District's curriculum consultants in all subject areas.

Curriculum Development

Prior to the opening of school, teachers were employed for a period of time to develop instructional units for each level. During each quarter break, time is set aside for further changes and improvement. During one quarter of the 1968-69 school year, a curriculum specialist was assigned to work exclusively in this program. The principal and teachers made extensive visitations to individualized programs throughout the state.

PART I - SOME BACKGROUND INFORMATION (Continued)

Curriculum Development (Continued)

The Director and the Coordinator of the Project visited the University Elementary School, University of California, Los Angeles, and later arranged to have Dr. Madeline Hunter, Principal of the University Elementary School, conduct meetings in the District relative to setting up an individualized program.

The Curriculum

Because of the four-quarter nature of the Park School program, it was necessary to modify the District's curriculum framework to meet the special needs of the year-around school.

Social Studies

To assure that each child would have an opportunity to study the different areas of the social studies curriculum, a two-year cycle program was developed by the District's social studies consultant for all levels. For example, during the four quarters of the 1968-1969 year, upper elementary students studied Mexico, Central America, South America, and World Geography. During the 1969-70 year, these students studied United States History and Canada.

Science

Two-year correlated units were developed for Park School with the assistance of the District's science consultant. Because of the nature of the State adopted science series, it was found that the main concepts and the supporting sub-concepts correlated very consistently, permitting rapid learners to move on to more difficult material and allowing reinforcement learning for students who had not achieved understanding of the concepts taught.

Reading

With the exception of kindergarten, all students attending Park are on a "staggered reading program." That is, one-half of a class arrives at 9:00 a.m. and the other half arrives at 10:00 a.m. The early arrivals are dismissed at 2:05 p.m. and the "ten o'clockers" are dismissed at 3:15 p.m.

The District's reading consultant developed a three-stage reading program for the District which was adopted by Park School. Stage I - Initial Reading; Stage II Automatic Recognition Response Stage (Comprehension and Advanced Word Study Skills); Stage III - Advanced Reading Development (Reading to Learn Stage).

Because of the "staggered" reading program, Park School teachers have been able to personalize their reading instruction. Each child is encouraged to proceed at his own rate.

PART I - SOME BACKGROUND INFORMATION (Continued)

Mathematics

Park School's mathematics program closely adheres to the one adopted by the District. Beginning at the kindergarten level, discussion and discovery are utilized to help the students build a foundation in number readiness which will enable them to work with more abstract concepts at the upper elementary level. At each level, both concrete and abstract experiences are introduced to clarify and extend concepts. As in the case of reading, students are encouraged to progress at their own rate. Students quickly learn how to work in pairs and in small groups without constant supervision from the teacher.

Curriculum Materials

The materials used in the Park School program are those available to all the schools in the District. In addition to these materials, the teachers and the curriculum specialist at Park School developed enrichment materials to meet the needs for individualized instruction. Special purchases were made for specific individualized materials.

Counseling

Prior to the opening of the first quarter of school, the teachers held 40-minute counseling sessions with each pupil to determine his needs and interests. In addition to this, individual conferences have been held during each quarter.

Orientation and programming for students entering junior high school in the fall are provided during the summer quarter by the junior high school counselor. A counseling session is held with both student and parent where they learn about the junior high program and go over the student's achievement and ability test results. During the counseling session both parents and students are given an opportunity to express their feelings concerning the year-around school. Thus far, it appears that both students and parents favor the program.

Evaluation

The enabling legislation charged the California State Department of Education with monitoring the evaluative procedures for Park School. One major evaluation report has been submitted to the State Board of Education entitled "A Feasibility Study: An Organizational and Curriculum Plan for a Four-Quarter Elementary School (1967-68 and 1968-69)." This included the results of the various assessment strategies used. Among these were parent and community reaction to the year-around school, pupil achievement and an analysis of financial matters.

Other evaluative reports are to be submitted at intervals of every three years. These reports are compiled under the direction of Dr. Wayne L. Sorenson, Director of Research and Federal Projects for the Hayward Unified School District.

PART II - ANALYSIS OF RESULTS OF SURVEYS AND QUESTIONNAIRES

- A. Certificated Staff Members Park School
- B. Random Sampling of District K-6 Teachers
not at Park School
- C. District K-6 Principal Survey
- D. Park School Parent Survey and Questionnaire
- E. Pupil Survey and Questionnaire
(Upper Elementary - Grades 4, 5 and 6)
- F. General Summary of the Results

This section of the evaluation report will present the results of the various questionnaires, surveys and opinionnaires conducted by the Research Department of the Hayward Unified School District. The order in which these reports appear is outlined above. Each questionnaire has been duplicated basically as it was presented to the various respondent groups. The results, in most cases, are presented as number of respondents and percent of responses for each part of the question. Comments representing general consensus by each group being surveyed are also presented.

PARK SCHOOL CERTIFICATED STAFF QUESTIONNAIRE CONCERNING THE FOUR-QUARTER PLAN
April 1972

Information and Directions:

This questionnaire has been designed to gather information and to make an assessment of the attitudes of certificated staff members teaching at Park Elementary School during the school year 1971-72.

Please check (✓) the space which most accurately represents your reactions to the Park School program. Your written comments will be greatly appreciated. The information you give will be used solely by the District Research Office in compiling significant information for the "Second Evaluation Report of the Four-Quarter Plan at Park Elementary School".

Read the entire questionnaire before proceeding to answer any part of it.

ANALYSIS OF THE RESULTS OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE

Total respondents - 11

* Numbers in parentheses refer to the number of responses

1. I prefer the four-quarter plan now in progress at Park School when compared to regular programs in most of the Hayward elementary schools.

* (7) (4) (0) (0) (0)
64% strongly agree 36% agree ___ disagree ___ strongly disagree ___ no opinion

2. I feel that I have more freedom to teach under the Park plan than I would have under other organizational plans.

(10) (1) (0) (0) (0)
91% strongly agree 9% agree ___ disagree ___ strongly disagree ___ no opinion

3. I feel that I have greater opportunity to try new instructional techniques under the Park plan.

(10) (1) (0) (0) (0)
91% strongly agree 9% agree ___ disagree ___ strongly disagree ___ no opinion

4. My clerical duties have not increased under the Park plan.

(1) (1) (3) (5) (1)
9% strongly agree 9% agree 27% disagree 46% strongly disagree 9% no opinion

5. My continuing education plans have not been interrupted by having a position at Park School.

(3) (4) (2) (2) (0)
28% strongly agree 36% agree 18% disagree 18% strongly disagree ___ no opinion

PARK SCHOOL CERTIFICATED STAFF QUESTIONNAIRE CONCERNING THE FOUR-QUARTER PLAN (continued)

6. The reporting system and teacher/parent conferences at Park School is working satisfactorily.

(2) (9) (0) (0) (0)
18% strongly agree 82% agree ___ disagree ___ strongly disagree ___ no opinion

7. If I had children of my own of elementary school age, I would want them to attend a school organized in the same manner as Park.

(5) (5) (0) (0) (1)
46% strongly agree 46% agree ___ disagree ___ strongly disagree 9% no opinion

8. The Park Elementary School plan lends itself to better teacher cooperation and mutual planning.

(4) (4) (1) (1) (1)
36% strongly agree 36% agree 9% disagree 9% strongly disagree 9% no opinion

9. The Park School pupils seem to be more highly motivated than other elementary pupils I have had the opportunity to observe.

(5) (4) (0) (0) (2)
46% strongly agree 36% agree ___ disagree ___ strongly disagree 18% no opinion

10. The element of pupil fatigue seems to be less at Park than at other elementary schools I have had the opportunity to observe.

(4) (3) (2) (0) (2)
36% strongly agree 28% agree 18% disagree ___ strongly disagree 18% no opinion

11. Teacher fatigue at Park School is not greater at this school as compared to other teaching situations in other elementary schools in this District.

(2) (3) (3) (2) (1)
18% strongly agree 28% agree 28% disagree 18% strongly disagree 9% no opinion

12. The teacher vacation periods now in effect at Park School are satisfactory.

(3) (5) (1) (1) (0)
30% strongly agree 50% agree 10% disagree 10% strongly disagree ___ no opinion

13. I feel that the pupil vacation periods at Park School to be satisfactorily accepted by the pupils.

(3) (8) (0) (0) (0)
27% strongly agree 73% agree ___ disagree ___ strongly disagree ___ no opinion

14. There is too much pupil freedom at Park School.

(1) (2) (4) (3) (1)
9% strongly agree 18% agree 36% disagree 28% strongly disagree 9% no opinion

PARK SCHOOL CERTIFICATED STAFF QUESTIONNAIRE CONCERNING THE FOUR-QUARTER PLAN (continued)

15. The four-quarter plan as now operating at Park School should be extended to other elementary schools in the District.

(5) (4) (1) (0) (1)
46% strongly agree 36% agree 9% disagree strongly disagree 9% no opinion

16. The four-quarter plan as now operating at Park School should be extended to some junior high schools in the District.

(7) (4) (0) (0) (0)
64% strongly agree 36% agree disagree strongly disagree no opinion

17. The multi-grade level at Park offers a better opportunity for the child to advance at his own rate than at the so-called graded school.

(9) (2) (0) (0) (0)
82% strongly agree 18% agree disagree strongly disagree no opinion

18. Parent participation and cooperation is greater at Park School than at other elementary schools I have known.

(2) (2) (3) (1) (2)
20% strongly agree 20% agree 30% disagree 10% strongly disagree 20% no opinion

19. The numerous visitors and observers of the Park School in operation have not been a hinderance to my operation as a teacher.

(3) (7) (0) (0) (1)
27% strongly agree 64% agree disagree strongly disagree 9% no opinion

20. The numerous visitors and observers of the Park School in operation have not hindered the learning efficiency of the pupils.

(4) (7) (0) (0) (0)
36% strongly agree 64% agree disagree strongly disagree no opinion

21. I believe that teacher cooperation and sharing at Park School is greater than at other elementary schools in this District.

(3) (4) (2) (0) (2)
38% strongly agree 36% agree 18% disagree strongly disagree 18% no opinion

22. Considering all aspects of the four-quarter plan at Park School, I would rate it as follows:

An Outstanding Program	(4)	36%
An Excellent Program	(5)	46%
A Good Program	(2)	18%
An Average Hayward Unified School District Elementary School Program	(0)	
A Below Average Elementary School Program	(0)	

PARK SCHOOL CERTIFICATED STAFF QUESTIONNAIRE CONCERNING THE FOUR-QUARTER PLAN (continued)

23. Listed below are some instructional concepts associated with the Park Four-Quarter Plan. Number in order of importance i.e., 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5, those concepts which you believe best represent the operational objectives of this plan. Mark only five listings.

- 12 More opportunity for parent participation in school related activities
- 4 Self-motivating environment
- 2 Non-graded classroom
- 10 Better student-teacher-parent relationships
- 3 Less loss of learning because of shorter vacation periods
- 7 No grades and report cards
- 9 Greater opportunity for teacher planning
- 8 Greater efficiency in the use of instructional resources and facilities
- 6 Greater opportunity for students to develop self-discipline
- 1 Individualized instruction
- 5 Continuous progress
- 11 Full year employment of teachers

COMMENT SUMMARY

Following are some representative comments from the certificated teaching staff in their evaluation of the extended year program. The comments are basically given as written by the respondents. Not all comments are included because of duplication of the general ideas, concepts and recommendations for improvement of the program.

1. I prefer the four-quarter plan now in progress at Park School when compared to regular programs in most of the Hayward elementary schools.

The Park Program has made itself felt throughout the District, and it is most encouraging to know of the innovative programs being established through the effort of individual schools and individual teachers.

2. I feel that I have more freedom to teach under the Park plan than I would have under other organizational plans.

Although it took me a little time to know and to believe, "freedom to teach" is built into the Park Program.

3. I feel that I have a greater opportunity to try new instructional techniques under the Park plan.

Individual and group situations make it possible for students to try work in a variety of ways.

4. My clerical duties have not increased under the Park plan.

I have so-o-o many more papers to mark because of the individualization, and this continues during the summer. Also, our conference forms require a great deal of writing twice a year.

Record keeping takes more time on an individualized program.

PARK SCHOOL CERTIFICATED STAFF QUESTIONNAIRE CONCERNING THE FOUR-QUARTER PLAN (continued)

4. My clerical duties have not increased under the Park plan. (continued)

They have trebeled!

Individualizing and increased class size have greatly increased the amount of record keeping necessary.

5. My continuing education plans have not been interrupted by having a position at Park School.

Plans to allow teachers to continue their education was resolved this past year. Through a revolving "leave of absence" schedule, Park teachers have several options available that have proved to be most satisfying.

I had previously planned to work for Masters, but find it too strenuous and time consuming for night school only, rather than summer school.

6. The reporting system and teacher/parent conferences at Park School is working satisfactorily.

Though much pleased with the current practice of reporting to parents, we need to take another look at the report form to make certain that parents and the student is receiving the message regarding the child's (student) Progress in areas not too well defined on the reporting form. The present reporting form does not give parents all they want to know.

8. The Park Elementary School plan lends itself to better teacher cooperation and mutual planning.

Teacher cooperation and mutual planning is moving right along. We are beginning to resolve the communication "gap" of levels of instruction. The principal has outlined a program to the Staff that should bring all levels of instruction closer together. No real problem. Strongly suspect we will move closer together this coming quarter.

We do some planning together, but since our workdays have continually been lessened there is just not the time to do the planning we would like to do.

In reality this is not so - the fault of a prima-donna heirachy and not the program!!

It should - but doesn't. Lack of leadership - common goals.

With some teachers, not everyone will. This works out very well and with our program we could do it even more. The plan itself is for more co-operation.

9. The Park School pupils seem to be more highly motivated than other elementary pupils I have had the opportunity to observe.

Though I "strongly agree", I am equally certain that our students are highly motivated, as are many children in other schools within the District. Sincerely believe other teachers are doing a great job. Park Staff will do all it can to assist other programs.

PARK SCHOOL CERTIFICATED STAFF QUESTIONNAIRE CONCERNING THE FOUR-QUARTER PLAN (continued)

9. The Park School pupils seem to be more highly motivated than other elementary pupils I have had the opportunity to observe. (continued)

I believe the motivation is directly related to individualizing of instruction, and being able to work with friends.

10. The element of pupil fatigue seems to be less at Park than at other elementary schools I have had the opportunity to observe.

Right! The four-quarter plan remains ideal with respect to "pupil fatigue". The kids are ready for a break after ten weeks of instruction.

Fatigue seems to be related to individual differences throughout the year, rather than everyone experiencing the "end of year slump".

11. Teacher fatigue at Park School is not greater at this school as compared to other teaching situations in other elementary schools in this District.

We are rejuvenated four times a year, but we also "run down" four times a year - at the end of each quarter.

We work harder! It is difficult to keep up with an individualized program.

12. The teacher vacation periods now in effect at Park School are satisfactory.

I feel a teacher needs at least 3 full weeks of work days plus vacation, say 2 days for planning - remainder rest.

I feel that we need more workdays (at least a week after each quarter as in the original plan). Otherwise, I find that I "work like a dog" during our abbreviated workweek, and then still end up taking a shopping bag-plus home. So in reality, with all the work I do at home, I don't really have a vacation. One week at school should take care of all the planning, etc., and then I could really rest for 2 weeks!

I agree as long as teachers have option of taking a few extra weeks or quarter off when planned ahead.

I would like a three week spread in September rather than in July. Also the first year we had more work days and chances to interview the children and we don't have time for it now.

13. I feel that the pupil vacation periods at Park School to be satisfactorily accepted by the pupils.

Mostly yes. Some kids complain, but am not certain if the complaint is real. It does seem that when kids are released for vacation, many of them return to help out during the work session days. Junior High students, former graduates, are now signing up to help out during the summer quarter.

PARK SCHOOL CERTIFICATED STAFF QUESTIONNAIRE CONCERNING THE FOUR-QUARTER PLAN (continued)

14. There is too much pupil freedom at Park School.

The "freedom" is "contracted" and individually deserved. On the surface it may not seem "structured", but the "freedom" given to any student is calculated by the teacher to improve or add to the total program of the child.

In some cases I feel the pupils need to be taught to respect the rights of others. Many are terribly inconsiderate and are never guided into the right channel.

I believe there may be at certain levels but in my own situation my students do not have too much freedom.

I think that even in this day and age old-fashioned respect should be expected towards adults. I would like to see the pupils do less unnecessary wandering up and down the halls, going to the library and really working in the hallways do not come under the heading of unnecessary.

Self-responsibility and self-discipline are not learned in a day or a week. It is a noisy process of learning to be responsible for oneself - but a worthwhile one. Learning is not inactive or necessarily quiet.

It is extremely difficult to keep track of all students at all times. Students know this and take advantage by wandering aimlessly through the halls disturbing other classes. Again this is related to class size.

15. The four-quarter plan as now operating at Park School should be extended to other elementary schools in the District.

Only if Year-Around Education is accepted by a majority of the community involved. Park has been successful because of parental support, teacher enthusiasm and enormous backing of the Administration, the Board and the dedicated leadership of the principal.

16. The four-quarter plan as now operating at Park should be extended to some junior high schools in the District.

Absolutely...especially Winton Junior High. Also, wish to thank the District for allowing our teachers to spend a day in visiting other schools within the District. Want to recommend that all Upper-Elementary teachers have the opportunity to spend a day visiting with our junior high friends.

For selfish reasons - I'd like to see what we've started carried through.

Less time is spent on review and it gives students a greater opportunity to pursue their personal interests and also work on their weaknesses without too much pressure, which often results in discouragement.

PARK SCHOOL CERTIFICATED STAFF QUESTIONNAIRE CONCERNING THE FOUR-QUARTER PLAN (continued)

17. The multi-grade level at Park offers a better opportunity for the child to advance at his own rate than at the so-called graded school.

I love knowing that I am going to have my children for two years, and then being able to plan a two-year reading program. I feel that it removes an awful lot of pressure to just "get thru" textbooks.

19. The numerous visitors and observers of the Park School in operation have not been a hinderance to my operation as a teacher.

No problem...often very interesting when there is time and opportunity to meet with them.

I don't especially enjoy visitors on Friday. However, most of the visitors have been kind and courteous and interested. I sort of wish that we could restrict them to just certain days of the week.

However - visitors often take a very superficial look at our program - are they getting anything out of it?

21. I believe that teacher cooperation and sharing at Park School is greater than at other elementary schools in the District.

A situation that is improving more and more. Considerable cooperation between individual staff members...more so at the upper-elementary level, but there should be considerable more improvement during the coming quarters. Yes, there is more teacher cooperation and sharing at Park, but the thing that I am trying to say is...we could do so much more.

We have discussed many things that we would like to do together or share which would benefit the students greatly, however, lack of planning and preparation time have made it impossible for us to work out most of these projects.

At some levels participation in sharing and helping each other out but I feel although the program lends itself to it, because of some personality differences it is not done as much as could/should be.

24. List three of the most significant strengths of the Park plan.

Other than the items checked above, another crucial factor is the enormous flexibility of the total program. The fact that teacher and pupil personalities are taken into consideration not only in the placement of a student, but if conflicts should arise during the course of the year, the Principal has been very helpful in resolving the "conflicts".

An additional strength of the Park program might be called "precision placement of the child" in the areas of reading, math, spelling and language arts. Utilizing many different types of testing devices, members of the staff can pin-point exactly where the achievement level of the student is within a day or two. I am truly proud of our effort as we continue to improve our endeavor in this area.

PARK SCHOOL CERTIFICATED STAFF QUESTIONNAIRE CONCERNING THE FOUR-QUARTER PLAN (continued)

24. List three of the most significant strengths of the Park plan. (continued)

A third strength - not easily defined is the fact that the entire staff is extremely proud to be associated with the uniqueness and fineness of the Year-Around Program.

More opportunity for enrichment activities.

Principal-teacher dedication to worth of the child as a precious individual.

Freedom to teach as we really believe - to try new things - to be ourselves in our work with students.

Keeping children off the street and gainfully occupied during the summer.

Individualization - using it, experimenting with methods - if they work, fine!, if not, try something else, and maybe still another something else (incidentally without someone looking over your shoulder, but just offering moral support!)

Children learn how to "do things" for themselves.

The opportunity to work together in groups or alone.

The opportunity to work at one's own rate.

Longer period of learning for children.

Teachers have some workdays to plan and think.

First program in a long time to try to change approaches all at same time - non-graded - individual - four-quarter. We have inspired others to do some thinking and some changing.

25. List three of the most significant weaknesses of the Park plan.

We require more space at all levels of instruction. A study hall is an absolute necessity at middle and upper elementary levels; an art room is another must and an empty room for such special programs as family living, world geography, social studies discussion groups, tape recording, drama, etc.

A more sophisticated system of admitting out-of-attendance area children is felt by all members of the staff. If such a system is not established, then we had better formulate a philosophy or statement that will enable the staff to accept the present policy.

Park School should be allowed a little more freedom in adopting the calendar for the Year-Around Program. We resent any interference by HUTA or AFT. And we should like to have our desire for more work days given more careful attention. One has to be part of the working team at Park before realizing how vital those few extra work days are.

PARK SCHOOL CERTIFICATED STAFF QUESTIONNAIRE CONCERNING THE FOUR-QUARTER PLAN (continued)

25. List three of the most significant weaknesses of the Park plan. (continued)

Need for a vice-principal to organize materials and to help the teacher give proper guidance to children who need special help.

Lack of materials that are especially adapted to individualization.

Lack of consistency in what is expected of pupils in their relation to each other and adults, and in their respect for property.

The program and materials should be better organized schoolwide.

There should be a more consistent recording of child's progress.

I feel that the Principal has too many outside commitments expected of him, we need him here more to continue giving us his guidance; I rely on his calm help.

We need more communication between levels, administration, etc.

The report form needs improving.

Worthwhile long range curriculum planning.

I also question whether administrators can judge our program when their visits have paid just lip service to observation. The very few times I have had any member of the administration in my room they have come in, smiled charmingly and exited in record time.

Class size too large in primary grades for an individualized program.

Children from out of the attendance area (including Child Care Center) have many emotional problems. They may need a more structured situation.

Need for more instructional aides to help with individual program.

Please list 3-5 recommendations which you consider would improve organizational aspects and/or instructional programs of the Park Elementary extended school year:

Wish to recommend that the Principal not be given such additional responsibilities as the Children's Center. Park may be considered a "small" school enrollment wise, but, when one consider program, it suddenly becomes a very "big" school.

Strongly urge that the school secretary be granted some part-time help.

Would like to receive more assistance from Cal State College. It is our feeling that they are not doing half the job they should be doing to enhance Year-Around Education. Lend us assistance in the development of a superior Physical Education program. An exchange teacher program. Would like to have some of our people assume the teaching assignments of Cal State instructors while they assume the role of classroom teacher. Believe we should really give this one a real try.

PARK SCHOOL CERTIFICATED STAFF QUESTIONNAIRE CONCERNING THE FOUR-QUARTER PLAN (continued)

Please list 3-5 recommendations which you consider would improve organizational aspects and/or instructional programs of the Park Elementary extended school year: (continued)

Absolutely insist that all teacher aides assigned to upper-elementary be interviewed and hired by the staff. No exceptions.

The staff would like to have a voice in hiring permanent teachers.

Music help for all grades. Reading teacher.

A better or more efficient method of organizing and sharing of materials needs to be implemented.

When a teacher resigns, a regular teacher should take her place rather than just a substitute since this teacher would be more willing to put forth the effort to do a good job in the classroom. She is especially important with our program.

Please give us back the workdays we had at the beginning of the program - this will help the children as it will give us more "quiet time" to sit down, reflect on the progress made in the previous quarter, and make individual plans for each pupil -- this does take a continuing amount of time, so we do it "on our own" during each quarter.

Need rooms enlarged (walls knocked out) for team-teaching approaches.

More team-teaching.

Need individualized materials for language.

A regular substitute - one familiar with Park.

There needs to be more emphasis on teacher personality, strengths, weaknesses in the assignment of students.

More staff responsibility in setting up how existing materials should be organized and utilized.

A new report card - reporting device for Lower Elementary.

Establish more consistent record keeping system.

Individualized material - we also want a voice in choosing curriculum materials. State issued texts are not self teaching and are not designed for individualized use.

Need for school and grade level curriculum center - we can organize ourselves.

Need for school and grade level curriculum sequence - organization of materials. Energies are being duplicated and scattered.

Probationary period for children entering from outside the attendance area.

HAYWARD UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
Educational Services Division
Department of Research and Federal Projects

TO: A Selected Sampling of K-6 Teachers in the
Hayward Unified School District

FROM: Wayne L. Sorenson, Director of Research and Federal Projects

SUBJECT: K-6 TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE CONCERNING THE PARK FOUR-QUARTER
PLAN. May 1972

My office has randomly selected 125 K-6 teachers from the elementary schools of Hayward to serve as a representative sampling of K-6 teachers not at Park Elementary School.

We are asking those selected to take a few minutes of their time and complete the enclosed questionnaire and return it by Wednesday, May 12 in the enclosed envelope.

The results of this questionnaire/opinionnaire will be tabulated and used in the "Second Evaluation Report of the Park Extended Year Program". I will send each of those selected a summary of the results of this questionnaire and other related details.

Your voluntary cooperation in completing this questionnaire at this very busy time of the year will be greatly appreciated.

WLS:sd:dp
May 4, 1972

Enc.

K-6 TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE - PARK SCHOOL FOUR-QUARTER PLAN
May 1972

SUMMARY OF RESULTS

Information and Directions:

This questionnaire has been designed to gather information from 125 randomly selected K-6 teachers not teaching at Park Elementary School, concerning their opinions and general reaction toward the Four-Quarter Plan.

Please check (✓) the space which most accurately represents your reactions to the Park School Program. Your written comments will be greatly appreciated. The information you give will be used solely by the District Research Office in compiling significant information for the "Second Evaluation Report of the Four-Quarter Plan at Park Elementary School".

*Numbers in parentheses refer to number of responses Total respondents - 83

1. I support the general concept of the organizational plan of the Four-Quarter School year at Park.

*(14) (27) (10) (16) (14)
17% strongly agree 34% agree 12% disagree 20% strongly disagree 17% undecided

2. The multi-grade school such as at Park offers a better opportunity for the child to advance at his own rate than at the traditional graded school.

(13) (36) (10) (3) (19)
16% strongly agree 44% agree 12% disagree 4% strongly disagree 24% undecided

3. Having the majority of master type teachers on the staff would be a necessity to effectively operate a four-quarter school year such as the Park Four-Quarter Plan.

(13) (28) (18) (4) (13)
17% strongly agree 37% agree 24% disagree 5% strongly disagree 17% undecided

4. If I had a child in the elementary school, I would want that child enrolled in the Four-Quarter Program in operation at Park Elementary School.

(11) (9) (17) (22) (22)
14% strongly agree 11% agree 21% disagree 27% strongly disagree 27% undecided

5. The Four-Quarter Program would provide greater opportunity for inservice education for teachers.

(12) (21) (13) (13) (21)
16% strongly agree 26% agree 16% disagree 16% strongly disagree 26% undecided

6. The Four-Quarter Program should be extended to all K-6 schools in the District.

(7) (4) (14) (32) (24)
9% strongly agree 5% agree 17% disagree 39% strongly disagree 30% undecided

K-6 TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE - PARK SCHOOL (continued)

7. There has been adequate communication to K-6 teachers of the District concerning the program and progress of the Park School Four-Quarter Plan.

(2) (10) (37) (32) (2)
2% strongly agree 12% agree 45% disagree 39% strongly disagree 2% undecided

8. Listed below are some instructional concepts associated with the Park Four-Quarter Plan. Number in order of importance, i.e., 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5, those concepts which you believe best represent the operational objectives of this plan. Mark only five listings.

<u>12</u>	More opportunity for parent participation in school related activities
<u>4</u>	Self-motivating environment
<u>2</u>	Non-graded classroom
<u>11</u>	Better student-teacher-parent relationships
<u>3</u>	Less loss of learning because of shorter vacation periods
<u>9</u>	No grades and report cards
<u>5</u>	Greater opportunity for teacher planning
<u>7</u>	Greater efficiency in the use of instructional resources and facilities
<u>10</u>	Greater opportunity for students to develop self-discipline
<u>1</u>	Individualized instruction
<u>8</u>	Continuous progress
<u>6</u>	Full year employment of teachers

9. From what I know about the Park Four-Quarter Plan, I would rate it as follows:
 The higher the number selected, the higher the rating.

An outstanding program	(8)	12%
An excellent program	(9)	13%
A good program	(27)	39%
An average Hayward Unified School District Elementary School program	(21)	30%
A below average elementary school program	(4)	6%

SUMMARY AND AN ANALYSIS OF THE K-6 TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE NOT AT PARK SCHOOL

- One hundred and four (104) K-6 teachers received this questionnaire. Eighty-three completed and returned them. This was an eighty percent (80%) return.
- As anticipated this group was not as supportive of the general concept and organizational plan of the four-quarter school year as the teachers at Park. Only fifty-one percent (51%) were supportive while ninety percent (90%) of the teachers at Park expressed strong support and satisfaction with the program.
- Only fourteen percent (14%) of the non-Park teachers thought that the Park Four-Quarter Plan should be extended to all K-6 schools in the District. Thirty-one percent (31%) of the K-6 principals thought this should be done. This is a fifteen percent (15%) increase over the response from the same group in May, 1969.
- Twenty-five percent (25%) of the non-Park teachers rated the program as outstanding or excellent. Sixty-nine percent (69%) rated it as a good program or average program, while 6% rated the Park Four-Quarter Year as poor.
- Twenty-five percent (25%) of the non-Park teacher group would want their own children in the program. Forty-eight percent (48%) were definitely against this and twenty-seven percent (27%) were undecided.

Following are some written comments given by the K-6 (non-Park teachers): (These comments are duplicated as written by them.)

- "I'm against this type of program. Children need to be children they need their summer vacations and time to be kids."
- "Let Park experiment with the four-quarter plan. The 'Hawthorne effort' seems to be aiding them in publicity, etc."
- "I'm not against this plan - I just don't know enough about it, however I would like to be part of an innovative program."
- "The four-quarter plan should be extended to one or two more schools. Perhaps an ESEA target school should be the next one. At least there would be a different socio-economic group and people from less affluent backgrounds sending children to that type of school."
- "All elementary schools in this District should have more information about the Park Plan. The communication is poor!"
- "Scuttlebutt has it that teachers are not happy, are coerced by administration and State Department of Education into selling program. I feel more communication throughout District would be beneficial. There seems to be a negative attitude rather than positive one at my school."

Questions have been posed that District will not allow a teacher to select a term of 3 quarters but must elect a full year program.

Money advantages do not seem tantamount but the idea of rotating time 'off' seems of prime importance.

There is a definite need for setting the 'record straight'."

SUMMARY AND AN ANALYSIS OF THE K-6 TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE NOT AT PARK SCHOOL (continued)

- o "I feel that the Park School Program, as I have seen it in operation, is fine for the highly-motivated, eager student. Unfortunately, the majority of children of elementary school age do not have adequate self-discipline to operate in the type of free program they have at Park. As a result most (I think) children learn to be time-wasters."
- o "I think the Four-Quarter plan is very good for the students but I don't believe I would like to teach the four quarters."
- o "There is very little communication between Park School's non-graded levels and other elementary schools. This form is unfair to all in filling out because we do not have adequate objective information to make an assessment."
- o "I have heard comments about Park which are very positive - an innovative school, but I am new in the District and know virtually nothing about Park."
- o "I would like to see the school program myself and hope to visit this summer. I am especially interested in observing 'individualized instruction' materials used, and quality of work done by students."
- o "Reorganize curriculum before instituting the plan!"
- o "I don't know how effective it is but I would assume it depends on the quality of teaching not year round school."
- o "I don't feel this program has proven itself."
- o "You must have a very 'Spartan' group of teachers working in the program. I don't think enough provision has been made for their emotional, physical, and mental health with so little time off. Two of the three week rest periods granted the children are mutilated for teachers with (I grant) much needed preparation and parent conferences."
- o "I wish all Hayward schools would go on the Four-Quarter Program."
- o "If all schools in District went on four quarters we would need air conditioning."
- o "I'm strongly in favor of an ungraded primary program and conferences with parents instead of reports. If this is the only way it can be attained I would strongly favor it."
- o "I feel the general concept is sound - but the program could be used more efficiently. There seems to be too little structure, and too much noise and chaos."
- o "The appeal (to me) lies in the flexibility of pupil movement and placement. Also, the frequent 'breathers' and time for long-range planning."
- o "I fail to understand the values of the four-quarter program as a means of improving instruction. What is the purpose of extending the school year as opposed to a reduction in class sizes, teacher preparation time, increasing the availability of instructional materials, and the expansion of pupil services (e.g. psychological services)? Numerous changes could be made to improve the existing program that is offered during the traditional school year."

THE PARK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL FOUR-QUARTER PLAN - K-6 PRINCIPAL SURVEY
HAYWARD UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

COMPARISON OF RESULTS

November, 1969

April, 1972

Principals responding - 34

Principals responding - 29

*Numbers in parentheses refer to the number of responses

1. Teacher clerical work would not increase with the Four-Quarter Plan in operation.

	<u>Strongly Agree</u>		<u>Agree</u>		<u>Disagree</u>		<u>Strongly Disagree</u>		<u>Undecided</u>	
1969	*(0)		(6)	18%	(19)	56%	(6)	18%	(3)	8%
1972	(1)	3%	(11)	38%	(10)	35%	(5)	17%	(2)	7%

2. The multi-grade school such as at Park, offers a better opportunity for the child to advance at his own rate than at the traditional graded school.

	<u>Strongly Agree</u>		<u>Agree</u>		<u>Disagree</u>		<u>Strongly Disagree</u>		<u>Undecided</u>	
1969	(8)	23%	(16)	47%	(5)	15%	(0)		(5)	15%
1972	(8)	27%	(10)	35%	(4)	14%	(3)	10%	(4)	14%

3. Having the majority of master type teachers on the staff would be a necessity to effectively operate a four-quarter school year such as the Park Four-Quarter Plan.

	<u>Strongly Agree</u>		<u>Agree</u>		<u>Disagree</u>		<u>Strongly Disagree</u>		<u>Undecided</u>	
1969	(4)	12%	(15)	44%	(9)	26%	(2)	6%	(4)	12%
1972	(3)	10%	(15)	52%	(8)	28%	(2)	7%	(1)	3%

4. If I were a teacher in the elementary school, I would prefer to teach in a four-quarter school year organized as the Park Elementary School.

	<u>Strongly Agree</u>		<u>Agree</u>		<u>Disagree</u>		<u>Strongly Disagree</u>		<u>Undecided</u>	
1969	(6)	25%	(6)	25%	(11)	32%	(8)	23%	(3)	15%
1972	(5)	17%	(8)	28%	(8)	28%	(6)	20%	(2)	7%

5. If I had a child in the elementary school, I would want that child enrolled in the Four-Quarter Program in operation at Park Elementary School.

	<u>Strongly Agree</u>		<u>Agree</u>		<u>Disagree</u>		<u>Strongly Disagree</u>		<u>Undecided</u>	
1969	(5)	15%	(7)	21%	(9)	26%	(3)	23%	(5)	15%
1972	(4)	14%	(10)	35%	(6)	20%	(8)	28%	(1)	3%

PARK SCHOOL FOUR-QUARTER PLAN - K-6 PRINCIPAL SURVEY (continued)

6. The Four-Quarter Program would provide greater opportunity for inservice education for teachers.

	<u>Strongly Agree</u>		<u>Agree</u>		<u>Disagree</u>		<u>Strongly Disagree</u>		<u>Undecided</u>	
1969	(7)	21%	(17)	50%	(4)	12%	(0)		(6)	17%
1972	(11)	39%	(14)	50%	(2)	7%	(0)		(1)	4%

7. The Four-Quarter Program would provide opportunities for greater parent cooperation and communication when parent-teacher conferences are used instead of the formal report card.

	<u>Strongly Agree</u>		<u>Agree</u>		<u>Disagree</u>		<u>Strongly Disagree</u>		<u>Undecided</u>	
1969	(13)	38%	(12)	35%	(3)	9%	(3)	9%	(3)	9%
1972	(8)	29%	(14)	52%	(3)	11%	(1)	4%	(1)	4%

8. There would be more teacher time devoted to daily lesson preparation under the Park Four-Quarter Plan than under the typical elementary school program.

	<u>Strongly Agree</u>		<u>Agree</u>		<u>Disagree</u>		<u>Strongly Disagree</u>		<u>Undecided</u>	
1969	(8)	23%	(9)	27%	(4)	12%	(3)	9%	(10)	29%
1972	(4)	15%	(6)	22%	(8)	30%	(3)	11%	(6)	22%

9. The Four-Quarter Program should be extended to all K-6 schools in the District.

	<u>Strongly Agree</u>		<u>Agree</u>		<u>Disagree</u>		<u>Strongly Disagree</u>		<u>Undecided</u>	
1969	(3)	9%	(2)	6%	(8)	23%	(9)	27%	(12)	35%
1972	(6)	21%	(3)	10%	(6)	21%	(12)	41%	(2)	7%

10. The Four-Quarter Program should be extended to at least two more K-6 schools in the District, one of these should include a school designated as a "target school" under the definition of ESEA Title I guidelines.

	<u>Strongly Agree</u>		<u>Agree</u>		<u>Disagree</u>		<u>Strongly Disagree</u>		<u>Undecided</u>	
1969	(5)	15%	(19)	56%	(0)		(3)	9%	(7)	20%
1972	(9)	31%	(18)	62%	(2)	7%	(0)		(0)	

11. There has been adequate communication to the elementary school principals concerning the program and progress of the Park School Four-Quarter Plan.

	<u>Strongly Agree</u>		<u>Agree</u>		<u>Disagree</u>		<u>Strongly Disagree</u>		<u>Undecided</u>	
1969	(1)	3%	(6)	18%	(14)	41%	(11)	32%	(2)	6%
1972	(7)	24%	(8)	27%	(10)	35%	(2)	7%	(2)	7%

PARK SCHOOL FOUR-QUARTER PLAN - K-6 PRINCIPAL SURVEY (continued)

12. Considering all aspects of Four-Quarter Plan at Park School, I would rate it as follows:

	1969	1972
An Outstanding Program	(1) 3%	(6) 21%
An Excellent Program	(10) 32%	(3) 11%
A Good Program	(16) 50%	(11) 39%
An Average Hayward Unified School District Elementary School Program	(5) 15%	(8) 29%
A Below Average Elementary School Program	(0)	(0)

13. If the teachers at my school had the opportunity to evaluate the Park Four-Quarter Plan, I believe they, as a group, would give the program the following composite rating.

	1969	1972
An Outstanding Program	(1) 3%	(2) 7%
An Excellent Program	(5) 15%	(2) 7%
A Good Program	(19) 60%	(14) 48%
An Average Hayward Unified School District Elementary School Program	(6) 19%	(11) 38%
A Below Average Elementary School Program	(1) 3%	(0)

14. Listed below are some instructional concepts associated with the Park Four-Quarter Plan. Number in order of importance, i.e., 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5, those concepts which you believe best represent the operational objectives of this plan. Mark only five listings.

1969	1972	
<u>12</u>	<u>12</u>	More opportunity for parent participation in school related activities
<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	Self-motivating environment
<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	Non-graded classroom
<u>10</u>	<u>10</u>	Better student-teacher-parent relationships
<u>2</u>	<u>2</u>	Less loss of learning because of shorter vacation periods
<u>9</u>	<u>9</u>	No grades and report cards
<u>7</u>	<u>8</u>	Greater opportunity for teacher planning
<u>8</u>	<u>7</u>	Greater efficiency in the use of instructional resources and facilities
<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	Greater opportunity for students to develop self-discipline
<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	Individualized instruction
<u>6</u>	<u>5</u>	Continuous progress
<u>11</u>	<u>11</u>	Full year employment of teachers

15. I have visited the Park Elementary School during the school year 1969-70 and 1971-72 to gain more information about the program and also to see it in operation.

1969	YES	(16)	47%	NO	(18)	53%
1972	<u>YES</u>	(17)	68%	<u>NO</u>	(8)	32%

BOARD OF EDUCATION

ARNOLD BIELLA
GREGORY MICHAELS
PHILIP SILVER
MRS. DOLORES WAGNER
MARVIN S. WEINREB, M.D.



HAYWARD UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

Post Office Box 5000, Hayward, California 94544 - Telephone 415/538-6100
Raymond G. Arveson, Superintendent

May 3, 1972

Dear Park School Parent:

Attached is a Parent Questionnaire - Park Elementary Four-Quarter School Year. This questionnaire has been designed to make an assessment of the attitudes and degree of support of parents of pupils now attending Park Elementary School. The results of this questionnaire will be used in the "Second Evaluation Report of the Four-Quarter Plan at Park School".

We are asking each family having children enrolled at Park to complete this questionnaire and return it within the next three or four days. Please place in the attached envelope, seal the envelope, and return via your child.

Your comments and suggestions will be most welcome. Do not sign your name to this questionnaire unless you want to.

The results of this survey and the total evaluation report will be given to you as soon as the final report is complete.

We most sincerely thank you for your continued cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

Wayne L. Sorenson, Director
Research and Federal Projects

Bernard Moura
Principal, Park School

Enc.

WLS:BPM:sd

Part II - Page 19

PARENT QUESTIONNAIRE - PARK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
FOUR-QUARTER SCHOOL YEAR
(May 1972)

SUMMARY OF RESULTS

Information and Directions:

This questionnaire has been designed to gather information and to make an assessment of the attitudes of parents of pupils now attending Park Elementary School.

Please check (✓) the space which most accurately represents your reactions to the Park School Extended Year Program. Your written comments will also be greatly appreciated. The information from this questionnaire will be used by the District Research Office in compiling information for the "Second Evaluation Report of the Four-Quarter Plan at Park Elementary School".

Read the entire questionnaire before you answer any part of it.

*Number in parentheses refer to number of responses. Total respondents-202

1. Vacation planning has not been adversely affected by the Park Four-Quarter Plan.

(61)	(97)	(21)	(11)	(12)
30% strongly agree	49% agree	10% disagree	5% strongly disagree	6% undecided

2. There has been adequate communication from the school concerning the progress of the Park program.

(43)	(103)	(31)	(10)	(15)
21% strongly agree	52% agree	15% disagree	5% strongly disagree	7% undecided

3. The Park program has offered additional opportunities for my child to receive individualized instruction.

(82)	(73)	(13)	(10)	(24)
41% strongly agree	36% agree	6% disagree	5% strongly disagree	12% undecided

4. Under the Park program my child has developed patterns of behavior for greater self-motivation and direction.

(60)	(82)	(16)	(7)	(35)
30% strongly agree	41% agree	8% disagree	3% strongly disagree	18% undecided

5. There is too much pupil freedom at Park School.

(22)	(30)	(78)	(36)	(36)
10% strongly agree	15% agree	39% disagree	18% strongly disagree	18% undecided

6. I believe that under the Park program, there has been less loss of learning (due to longer summer vacations), than at other District elementary schools with different vacation schedules.

(100)	(69)	(5)	(5)	(21)
50% strongly agree	35% agree	2% disagree	2% strongly disagree	11% undecided

PARENT QUESTIONNAIRE - Park Elementary School (continued)

7. My interest in school-related activities during the past two years has increased because of the Park program.

(23) (65) (42) (8) (56)
12% strongly agree 34% agree 22% disagree 3% strongly disagree 29% undecided

8. My child reacts favorably to his or her experiences at Park School.

(89) (94) (9) (1) (7)
45% strongly agree 47% agree 4% disagree 1% strongly disagree 3% undecided

9. The parent/teacher conferences which I have participated in have been very satisfactory and of value to me.

(75) (94) (13) (4) (16)
37% strongly agree 47% agree 6% disagree 2% strongly disagree 8% undecided

10. I would prefer the more formal report card in place of the type of evaluation report used at Park School.

(26) (22) (76) (46) (29)
13% strongly agree 11% agree 38% disagree 23% strongly disagree 15% undecided

11. Vacation planning has been made easier for my family because of the Park plan.

(38) (57) (46) (11) (45)
19% strongly agree 29% agree 23% disagree 6% strongly disagree 23% undecided

12. My child has shown a greater interest in school because of the Park program.

(65) (72) (14) (3) (41)
33% strongly agree 37% agree 7% disagree 2% strongly disagree 21% undecided

13. Listed below are some instructional concepts associated with the Park Four-Quarter Plan. Number in order of importance, i.e. 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5, those concepts which you believe best represent the operational objectives of this plan. Mark only five listings:

<u>12</u>	More opportunity for parent participation in school related activities
<u>2</u>	Self-motivating environment
<u>7</u>	Non-graded classroom
<u>9</u>	Better student-teacher-parent relationships
<u>1</u>	Less loss of learning because of shorter vacation periods
<u>10</u>	No grades and report cards
<u>8</u>	Greater opportunity for teacher planning
<u>6</u>	Greater efficiency in the use of instructional resources and facilities
<u>5</u>	Greater opportunity for students to develop self-discipline
<u>4</u>	Individualized instruction
<u>3</u>	Continuous progress
<u>11</u>	Full year employment of teachers

PARENT QUESTIONNAIRE - Park Elementary School (continued)

14. The four-quarter plan as now operating at Park School should be extended to other elementary schools in the District.

(106) (57) (6) (6) (18)
55% strongly agree 30% agree 3% disagree 3% strongly disagree 9% undecided

15. The four-quarter plan as now operating at Park School should be extended to some junior high schools in the District.

(102) (54)] (9) (11) (23)
51% strongly agree 26% agree 5% disagree 6% strongly disagree 12% undecided

16. The multi-grade level at Park offers a better opportunity for the child to advance at his own rate than at the graded school.

(92) (82) (7) (4) (10)
47% strongly agree 41% agree 3% disagree 4% strongly disagree 5% undecided

17. The numerous visitors and observers of the Park School in operation have not hindered the learning efficiency of the pupils.

(45) (99) (7) (3) (36)
24% strongly agree 52% agree 4% disagree 1% strongly disagree 19% undecided

18. As far as I have been able to observe, I believe that teacher cooperation, planning, and sharing at Park School is greater than at other elementary schools I have known.

(67) (72) (7) (3) (46)
34% strongly agree 37% agree 4% disagree 1% strongly disagree 24% undecided

19. Considering all aspects of the four-quarter plan at Park School, I would rate it as follows. The higher the number chosen, the higher the rating.

An outstanding program	(91)	48%
An excellent program	(43)	23%
A good program	(46)	24%
An average Hayward Unified School District Elementary School Program	(7)	5%
A below average elementary school program	(0)	

SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS OF PARENT QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

- o Two hundred and two (202) Park School families responded. This is a seventy-five percent (75%) response from the 270 who were sent questionnaires.
- o Seventy-one percent (71%) rated the program as either outstanding or excellent while twenty-four percent (24%) rated it as good. Only 5% rated the program below average as compared to other District programs.
- o Twenty percent (20%) thought that communication from the school concerning the program of the Four-Quarter Plan at Park School should be improved. Seventy-three percent (73%) thought the communication had been satisfactory, while 7% were undecided.
- o Vacation planning had not been adversely affected by the Park Plan.
- o Eighty-five percent (85%) thought there had been less loss of learning due to the long summer vacation. Eleven percent (11%) were undecided about this, while 4% disagreed with this concept.
- o Individualized instruction - less loss of learning, because of shorter vacation periods were rated very high as important concepts associated with the Park Four-Quarter Plan (see question #13, Part II, Page 21 for details).
- o The parents continue to support the four-quarter year as organized at Park School. Approximately eighty percent (80%) of the parents are supportive, while twenty percent (20%) disagree with the basic plan or are undecided about some of its operational features and basic objectives.

Following are some written comments given by the parents. These comments are presented as written. The comments have been divided into two groups as follows:
Supportive of the Park Plan and Suggestions for Improvement of the Park Plan:-----

Supportive of the Park Plan:

- o "Yes, this program should be extended to some junior high schools in the District. This age group really needs something constructive to do in the summer. Also, vacations would coincide".
- o "We like the program for our son. He seems to do better with less regimentation."
- o "The program at Park is outstanding, but we parents do need more communication from the administration about the progress of this school".
- o "My children 'enjoy' Park in comparison to another school they previously attended".

SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS OF PARENT QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS (Continued)

Supportive (Continued)

- o "I still support the Park Plan, but I am a bit undecided about a number of issues and concerns I have. One is--- there seems to be too much free time for the pupils. I would like a more structural program, however I think the Park Plan is very good".
- o "Better learning opportunity for the child. The individualized instruction approach is a plus".
- o "The teachers at Park are to be praised. They are great -- my child has made much needed progress".
- o "On the whole, I feel that this is a very good system. I support the program and the hard-working principal and staff of this school which is in sort of 'a fish bowl'."
- o "The concept of self-discipline and the motivation is important at this school. My son has benefited by this approach. He needs some 'head room' to do his thing".
- o "The teacher-parent conference is great! Let's not use those old report cards, which did not communicate -- just confuse".
- o "I have a boy in the 8th grade at Winton Junior High. He liked the four-quarter year at Park and still believes as I do-- that Winton Junior High should be on the same plan as Park".
- o "I don't think there is too much pupil freedom at Park. It depends upon the definition of freedom-- however, I do believe in student control at all times -- maybe I'm talking about basic respect and school discipline here".
- o "I like the idea of teacher aides".
- o "From the parent-teacher conferences I have found that the teacher really knows my child and shows a true interest in her as an individual".
- o "I work as a parent volunteer in the Park library. The pupils make good use of this resource and are generally well behaved".
- o "The Park Program is too good to stop just at Park ---expand it to other schools--- especially Winton Junior High."

SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS OF PARENT QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS (Continued)

Suggestions for Improvement of the Park Program

- o "More discipline should be stressed at Park. Too much freedom".
- o "There seems to be no increase in achievement test scores especially when compared to Eden Gardens, the original comparison school".
- o "Not all children are able to work on their own without a great deal of pushing".
- o "I was against the program in the beginning and still feel the same way".
- o "A beautiful program for the fast learner, but offers nothing for the slow learner".
- o "Not enough structural studies and supervision of students".
- o "Some teachers are still making kids do homework during vacations to 'catch up' because they are behind. I resent this".
- o "The large class size at Park defeats the entire program".
- o "Please, smaller class size -- maybe down to 20 or 25 pupils".
- o "Too many families take their children out of school for summer vacation. They could avoid it, but don't seem to think it's important".
- o "Writing and grammar as well as penmanship is often neglected in the upper grades".
- o "I have visited the school on numerous occasions -- the halls are too noisy".
- o "Teachers at Park seem to pay more attention to the bright student. The slow one needs some attention too".
- o "Park needs more outside assemblies and other activities to serve as a stimulus to the school work".

PARK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PUPIL QUESTIONNAIRE
May 1972

Dear Pupil:

We want to ask you a few questions about you and your school. Please read each question or statement very carefully and then check the space which gives your answer to the question and at the same time shows how you feel about the statement or question being asked.

Thank you for your help in aiding us in completing this questionnaire. Many people are very interested in finding out what you, the pupil, at Park School think about your four-quarter school year and the education you receive.

Very sincerely,

HAYWARD UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
Research Office

ANALYSIS OF THE RESULTS OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE

Total respondents - 190 Girl ⁽⁸⁶⁾ 45% Boy ⁽¹⁰⁴⁾ 55%

*Numbers in parentheses refer to the number of responses

1. What is your grade placement at Park Elementary School?

Upper Elementary: ^{*(62)} 33% Grade 4 ⁽⁵⁹⁾ 31% Grade 5 ⁽⁶⁹⁾ 36% Grade 6

2. Have you attended Park School during all the years you have been in school?

⁽⁸⁸⁾ 47% Yes ⁽¹⁰¹⁾ 53% No

3. Do you like being in a class with children older than yourself?

⁽¹³⁸⁾ 73% Yes ⁽²⁷⁾ 14% No ⁽²⁴⁾ 13% Undecided

4. Do you like being in a class with children younger than yourself?

⁽¹²⁸⁾ 68% Yes ⁽³⁴⁾ 18% No ⁽²⁷⁾ 14% Undecided

5. Do you like the school vacations spread out as they are at Park School?

⁽¹³⁰⁾ 68% Yes ⁽³⁹⁾ 21% No ⁽²¹⁾ 11% Undecided

6. Do you like the boys and girls in your class this year?

⁽¹⁵⁷⁾ 83% Yes ⁽¹⁴⁾ 7% No ⁽¹⁹⁾ 10% Undecided

PARK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PUPIL QUESTIONNAIRE (continued)

7. Do you think your parents have had a difficult time in planning the vacation for your family because of the vacation schedules at Park?

(53)
28% Yes

(89)
47% No

(48)
25% I don't know

8. Do you like setting your own study schedules and "work to be done" in your classroom this year?

(159)
85% Yes

(16)
8% No

(14)
7% Undecided

9. Do you think your parents like the four-quarter school year at Park?

(143)
76% Yes

(20)
11% No

(25)
13% I don't know

10. Do you like the type of report card you now have at Park School?

(119)
63% Yes

(46)
24% No

(24)
13% Undecided

11. Do you like going to Park School?

(178)
94% Yes

(11)
6% No

12. Do you think Park School should return to the regular 10-month school year?

(44)
23% Yes

(129)
69% No

(16)
8% Undecided

13. Do you think that your parents would answer Question #12 the same way that you did?

(128)
68% Yes

(19)
10% No

(42)
22% I don't know

14. Does the shorter vacation periods help you to remember better the things you learned in school?

(141)
74% Yes

(32)
17% No

(17)
9% Undecided

15. How would you rate the instructional program provided by Park School?

(100)
56% Excellent

(45)
24% Very Good

(30)
16% Average

(7)
4% Below Average

SUMMARY AND AN ANALYSIS OF THE PARK ELEMENTARY PUPIL QUESTIONNAIRE

- o Total respondents was 190.
 - 33% from Grade 4 - 62 pupils
 - 31% from Grade 5 - 59 pupils
 - 36% from Grade 6 - 69 pupils
- o Forty-seven percent (47%) had attended Park school from Kindergarten through Grade 6.
- o Twenty-three percent (23%) said that they thought Park school should return to the regular 10 month school year. Sixty-nine percent (69%) said no, while 8% were undecided.
- o Fifty-six percent (56%) rated the instructional program at Park as being excellent; twenty-four percent (24%) as good; sixteen percent (16%) as average and 4% below average.
- o The sixth grade pupils were more critical of the four-quarter plan. This seems to be a general trend. Fifty (50) former sixth graders at Park (1969-70) now eighth grade pupils at Winton Junior High School were asked the question, "should Park School return to the 10 month school year?". Sixty-two percent (62%) answered yes to this question.
- o The Park-Winton eighth graders also preferred the report card where letter grades are given.
- o It is of interest to note that Park pupils thought that the shorter vacations aided them to remember more the things they had learned in school.

The comments from this group were varied but generally favorable for the Park program. A few of their comments are given:

- o "I like the Park Year-Around School - my parents like it too." (a sixth grade boy)
- o "We need a swimming pool - so we can cool off during the hot summer days we are in school." (a fifth grade boy)
- o "I don't like the four-quarter school plan. I want my summer so I can have more time to play." (a sixth grade girl)
- o "I like school. I like my teacher. I like my books. I like the 4-Q plan." (a fourth grade boy)
- o "Dump the four-quarter school year. I don't like it." (a sixth grade boy)
- o "More schools should be on this plan. Winton Junior High should be but aren't." (a sixth grade girl)

PART III - A REPORT OF TEST RESULTS, PARK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

Overview

The basis for this report of test results is the California State Mandated Testing Program. By using these scores the following is achieved:

- A broader base for comparing scores both at the District level and also at the State level.
- Eliminates excessive testing at a school where many activities of being part of an "innovative program", puts an added burden upon the child's interest and instructional time.
- Less cost involved by utilizing test information from a testing program which is mandated.
- School patrons and others are beginning to understand some of the positive and negative aspects of the present State Mandated Testing Program.

Scores Being Reported

The scores being reported are as follows:

- October and November testing 1969, 1970 and 1971, Grades 4, 5 and 6.
- May testing 1970, 1971 and 1972, Grades 1, 2 and 3.
- Minimum Standard Test, reading and mathematics. (This test was given to a group of fifty eighth grade students at Winton Junior High School during the first week of April 1972. These students had been sixth grade students at Park Elementary during the 1969-70 school year.)

Comparison Groups

As outlined in the following information Park School achievement scores, in selected tests, are compared to District elementary schools with approximately the same scholastic aptitude (I.Q.) scores at the sixth grade level for the fall testing 1969, 1970 and 1971. (See Appendix C for the listing of the comparison schools and other related information.)

- The average AFDC factor (Aid For Dependent Children) was 10% for the comparison schools, 1971-72. The range was 3% to 24%. The District range was 1% to 39%.
- There is a high positive correlation among the factors of group I.Q. scores, high percentage of AFDC families, free school lunch participation, scores received in standardized achievement tests and general socio-economic level of the school attendance area.

TABLE I

PARK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL TEST RESULTS, NOVEMBER 1969
(Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills - Form Q and R, Level 2)

GROUP	Median Grade Equivalent								
	Total Reading			Total Language			Total Arithmetic		
	Gr.4	Gr.5	Gr.6	Gr.4	Gr.5	Gr.6	Gr.4	Gr.5	Gr.6
Park	4.1	5.1	6.3	3.7	4.9	6.1	4.1	4.6	6.1
Comparison Group	4.4	5.2	6.4	4.1	5.0	5.9	4.2	5.1	6.2
District Score	4.0	4.9	5.8	3.6	4.8	5.5	3.9	4.9	5.9

Summary

- These results are compared to the District median (50th percentile) grade equivalent score in designated subject areas and the scores of thirteen (13) elementary schools in the District having approximately the same scholastic aptitude (I.Q.) verbal scores, Grade 6, November 1969. The scholastic aptitude scores for the comparison group represented a range of median school scores from 97 to 101. Park School median scholastic aptitude score for November 1969 was 100. The District median was 97.
- The Lorge-Thorndike Intelligence Test, Multi-Level Edition, Form 1, Level D, was the State mandated test given to 2065 sixth grade pupils in the District in November 1969. Sixty-five (65) Park pupils and 645 pupils in the comparison schools took this test.
- It is to be noted that Park School had a higher achievement level in all tests, except one, when compared to the District achievement for Grades 4, 5 and 6. This was at Grade 5, the total arithmetic score.
- The comparison group had a higher achievement level in all tests except total language, Grade 6. Here Park pupils exceeded the comparison group by two months.
- The Publisher's Norm for the Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills, given in the Fall of the year, would be 4.0 for Grade 4, 5.0 for Grade 5, and 6.0 for Grade 6.
- Park pupils had been receiving instruction under the four-quarter extended school year for only one year when these tests were administered.

TABLE II

PARK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL TEST RESULTS, NOVEMBER 1970
(Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills, Form Q and R, Level 2)

GROUP	Median Grade Equivalent								
	Total Reading			Total Language			Total Arithmetic		
	Gr.4	Gr.5	Gr.6	Gr.4	Gr.5	Gr.6	Gr.4	Gr.5	Gr.6
Park	4.2	5.4	6.3	4.0	4.8	5.9	3.6	5.0	5.5
Comparison Group	4.1	4.9	6.1	3.8	4.8	5.7	3.7	4.7	5.6
District Score	4.1	5.0	5.8	3.7	4.9	5.8	3.8	4.8	5.7

Summary

- These results are compared to the District median (50th percentile) grade equivalent score in designated subject areas and the scores of eight (8) elementary schools in the District having approximately the same scholastic aptitude (I.Q.) verbal scores, Grade 6, November 1970. The median school score for the comparison group represented a range of median scores from 96 to 98. Park School median score for November 1970 was 96. The median District score was 99.
- The Lorge-Thorndike Intelligence Test, Multi-Level Edition, Form 1, Level D, was given to 1883 sixth grade pupils in November 1970. Sixty-one (61) Park pupils and 419 pupils from the comparison schools took the test.
- When compared to the District scores, in the three tests under consideration, Park School scored higher in all tests except total language, Grade 5 and total arithmetic, Grades 4 and 6.
- Park School reading achievement levels were above both the comparison and District scores.
- The comparison group scored higher than Park in total arithmetic in Grades 4 and 6.
- Park School had been receiving instruction under the four-quarter plan for two years when these tests were given.
- It is to be noted that Park School scores at Grades 4, 5 and 6 improved as compared to the November 1969 scores.

TABLE III

PARK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL TEST RESULTS , OCTOBER 1971
(Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills, Form Q and R, Level 2)

GROUP	Median Grade Equivalent								
	Total Reading			Total Language			Total Arithmetic		
	Gr.4	Gr.5	Gr.6	Gr.4	Gr.5	Gr.6	Gr.4	Gr.5	Gr.6
Park	4.3	5.1	6.3	4.1	5.3	5.9	4.4	5.0	6.1
Comparison Group	3.7	4.6	5.7	3.7	4.9	5.8	3.7	4.8	5.7
District Score	3.7	4.7	5.8	3.4	4.7	5.5	3.5	4.6	5.5

Summary

- These results are compared to the District median (50th percentile) grade equivalent score in designated subject areas and the scores of sixteen (16) elementary schools in the District with approximately the same scholastic aptitude (I.Q.) verbal scores, Grade 6, October 1971. The scholastic aptitude scores for the comparison schools represented a range of median school scores from 98 to 101. Park School median scholastic aptitude score for October 1971 was 100.
- The Lorge-Thorndike Intelligence Test, Multi-Level Edition, Form 1, Level D, was given to 1898 sixth grade pupils in October 1971. Seventy-six (76) Park pupils and 858 pupils in the comparison group took this test.
- It is to be noted that Park School scored higher than the District median grade equivalent in the test results given in Table III.
- When the achievement levels of the Park pupils are compared with those of the comparison group, the following is shown:

<u>Total Reading</u>	-	Grade 4	-	Six months above comparison group
		Grade 5	-	Five months above comparison group
		Grade 6	-	Six months above comparison group
<u>Total Language</u>	-	Grade 4	-	Grade 4 - Four months above comparison group
		Grade 5	-	Grade 5 - Four months above comparison group
		Grade 6	-	Grade 6 - One month above comparison group
<u>Total Arithmetic</u>	-	Grade 4	-	Grade 4 - Seven months above comparison group
		Grade 5	-	Grade 5 - Two months above comparison group
		Grade 6	-	Grade 6 - Four months above comparison group
- Park pupils had been receiving instruction under the four-quarter extended school year for three years when these tests were administered.

TABLE IIIa

PARK SCHOOL NET GAINS GRADE 4 TO 6, NOVEMBER 1969 TO OCTOBER 1971

(California Tests of Basic Skills, Form Q and R, Level 2)

	<u>Reading</u>		Months Progress
	Grade 4 to 5 November 1970	Grade 5 to 6 October 1971	
Park	13	9	22
Comparison Group	5	8	13
District	13	6	19
<u>Language</u>			
Park	11	11	22
Comparison Group	7	10	17
District	13	6	19
<u>Arithmetic</u>			
Park	9	11	20
Comparison Group	5	10	15
District	9	7	16

TABLE IIIa (Continued)

PARK SCHOOL NET GAINS GRADE 4 TO 6, NOVEMBER 1969 to october 1971

Summary

- Table IIIa shows the net gains made by the Park pupils from Grade 4 to the November 1970 testing, when they were beginning the fifth grade, to October 1971 when they were tested at the beginning of the sixth grade.
- Forty (40) additional instructional days had been received by the Park pupils at the time of the November 1970 testing. This is equivalent to two additional school months of instruction.
- It is to be noted that in reading and language, the additional instructional time is reflected in the two months of additional net gain. Twenty (20) months gain would be expected.
- In arithmetic the net gains of an additional two months was not achieved.
- In the October 1971 testing, Park pupils exceeded the net gains of both the Comparison Group and District by the amounts shown in Table IIIa.

TABLE IV

PARK SCHOOL GRADE EQUIVALENT SCORES AT THE MEDIAN (50TH PERCENTILE), GRADES 1 AND 2
(Cooperative Primary Reading 12A and 23A)

	<u>Grade 1 - May 1970</u>		<u>Grade 2 - May 1971</u>	
Park	N=54	G.E. 2.0	N=57	G.E. 3.3
Comparison Group	N=983	G.E. 2.1	N=884	G.E. 3.0
District	N=2174	G.E. 1.9	N=2048	G.E. 2.9

Summary

Months gain made from May 1970 to May 1971 were as follows:

- Park School - 13 months gain
- Comparison Group - 9 months gain
- District - 10 months gain

	<u>Grade 1 - May 1971</u>		<u>Grade 2 - May 1972</u>	
Park	N=46	G.E. 1.8	N=51	G.E. 3.1
Comparison Group	N=895	G.E. 2.0	N=803	G.E. 3.1
District	N=2052	G.E. 1.9	All scores not available	Estimated 2.9

Summary

Months gain made from May 1971 to May 1972 were as follows:

- Park School - 13 months gain
- Comparison Group - 11 months gain
- District - 10 months gain*

*Not all the scores were available from the individual schools on May 22, 1972, the date the Evaluation Report went to press, however, the District score will probably be very close to the estimated score given in Table IV.

TABLE V

PARK SCHOOL GRADE EQUIVALENT SCORES AT THE MEDIAN (50TH PERCENTILE), GRADES 2 AND 3

(Cooperative Primary Reading 23A and 23B)

	<u>Grade 2 - May 1971</u>	<u>Grade 3 - May 1972</u>
Park	N=57 G.E. 3.3	N=53 G.E. 3.6
Comparison Group	N=884 G.E. 3.0	N=807 G.E. 3.7
District	N=2048 G.E. 2.9	All scores not available G.E. 3.5

Summary

Months gain made from May 1971 to May 1972 were as follows:

- Park School - 3 months gain
- Comparison Group - 7 months gain
- District - 6 months gain*

*Not all the scores were available from the individual schools on May 22, 1972, the date the Evaluation Report went to press, however, the District score will probably be very close to the estimated score given in Table V.

It should be noted that a number of schools with high grade equivalent scores at Grade 2, May 1971, made consistently less gain on the May 1972 testing. This may be due partly to the structure of the Grade 3 test, 23B, which may not accurately measure the reading achievement level of pupils who normally would score above the Q₃ level 75th percentile.

TABLE VI

PARK SCHOOL NET READING GAINS GRADE 1 TO GRADE 3, MAY 1970 TO MAY 1972
(Cooperative Primary Reading Tests, 12A, 23A and 23B)

	'70	'71	'72	Months Progress
Park	13	13	3	29
Comparison Group	9	11	7	27
District	10	10	6	26

Summary

- Under the Four-Quarter Extended School Year, Park School is in session approximately twenty (20) additional days per year. This evaluation report covers a period of three years, thus there have been sixty (60) additional days or three school months of additional instructional time. Based on this premise, Park School at the primary level, Grades 1, 2 and 3, has maintained its reading achievement level as compared to the District and Comparison Group.
- The net gains at the primary level would be expected to compensate for the additional instructional time.

TABLE VII

COMPARATIVE REPORT OF MINIMUM STANDARD TEST IN READING AND MATHEMATICS

8th GRADE STUDENTS AT WINTON JR. HIGH SCHOOL

Tests Given in April, 1972

READING

STUDENTS	N	RAW SCORE			MEAN	S.D.*
		Q ₁	Q ₂	Q ₃		
Park	50	53	59	65	57.84	10.41
Non-Park	199	42	52	61	50.84	12.56
Combined	249	44	54	62	52.31	12.48

MATHEMATICS

Park	50	26	31	36	30.80	6.48
Non-Park	199	19	24	30	24.45	7.93
Combined	249	20	25	31	25.68	8.70

WLS:dp
April, 1972

*Standard Deviation - A measure of the variability or dispersion of a set of scores. The more the scores cluster around the mean, the smaller the standard deviation.

ANALYSIS OF TABLE VII

- A longitudinal study is being conducted of Park pupils as they proceed to the junior and senior high school. The 1969-70 sixth graders are now eighth grade pupils at Winton Junior High School. Fifty (50) pupils were tested in April, 1972 by using the District developed Minimum Standard Test in reading and mathematics. The results are shown in Table VII.
- In reading achievement, Park pupils at the median (Q_2) scored seven raw score points above the non-Park pupils. This places them at the reading level of a beginning tenth grade student in the Hayward Unified School District, where this test is being standardized.
- There is also a seven point spread in mathematics at the median (Q_2). This places the Park group at the third month of the tenth year.
- The non-Park pupils at Winton Junior High School are achieving approximately one year and five months below the Park group in both reading and mathematics.
- At this point it is too early to know whether future testing and analyses will continue to give the same results. The spread in scores now shown may be the result of the different socio-economic levels represented by the Park and non-Park group.
- Related to the above information is the grade point average of the fifty (50) former Park pupils now attending Winton Junior High School. These grades are for the first semester of the school year 1971-72 and shows that these eighth grade pupils received a mean grade point of 3.06 or a "B" grade. The range of the grade point scores for the Park pupils was from 3.83 to 1.50.

PART IV

GENERAL SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

SUMMARY - SCHOOL AND COMMUNITY LIAISON

Visitors at Park School

- o 1970-71 230 visitors
- o 1971-72 234 visitors

Total in the two-year period = 464

Foreign Countries Represented

- o Israel, India, Guam

Representatives from Other States

- o Ten States: Wyoming, Minnesota, Illinois, Oregon, Georgia, South Carolina, Virginia, Massachusetts, Arizona, Ohio

Parent Participation

- o Approximately thirty (30) parents per year serve as library volunteers
- o Other parents serve in the kindergarten program

Liaison With College and Community Groups

- o High school tutorial program
- o California State College at Hayward student teaching program
- o Hayward Area Recreation District (HARD), special swimming lessons for Park pupils during the spring and fall vacation periods
- o N. Y. C. work experience program--working with Park students
- o Principal of Park School and two teachers from the school teach a course for California State College students at Hayward
- o Teachers and principal have served as speakers at local schools and other elementary schools outside the District to explain the Park Program
- o Principal and other District central office staff members served as participants in the 3rd and 4th National Seminar on the Year-Around School
- o "Learn to Swim" program conducted in cooperation with the student teaching activities at California State College at Hayward and Park pupils.

SUMMARY - PUPIL MOBILITY AT PARK SCHOOL

There are seventy-three (73) sixth grade pupils enrolled at Park School during the current school year, 1971-72. A breakdown of the number of years these pupils have been attending Park School gives some indication of pupil mobility at this school. This information follows:

<u>Number of Years at Park</u>	<u>Number of Pupils</u>	<u>(%) Percent</u>
7 years (K through 6)	32	44
6 "	4	5
5 "	5	7
4 "	11	15
3 "	3	4
2 "	11	15
1 "	7	10
Total	73	100

- o In a recent study, (May 1970) of the mobility factor of sixth grade pupils in all the elementary schools of the District, it was shown that forty percent (40%) of the pupils had attended District schools for all seven of the elementary school years, K-6.
- o Twenty-five percent (25%) of the sixth graders (18 pupils), were new to Park during the past two years.
- o The number of the sixth grade pupils in the school year 1969-70 who had attended Park School for all seven years, was forty-six percent (46%).
- o From the above information, it can be noted that there has been no great change in pupil mobility, at the sixth grade level at Park School. Information is not available for the other grades. At this point in the longitudinal study of Park pupils, basic data of this type is collected only for the sixth grade group.

SUMMARY - FINANCING THE EXTENDED SCHOOL YEAR

Certificated Salaries

Administrative costs to the District have in no way increased. However, there have been some additional services needed for research and evaluation.

The salaries of the teachers have been increased approximately 15% each year on a prorated basis. The salary of the principal has increased from 4-6% each year on a prorated basis. The secretary's salary has also been increased from 4-6% each year. These increases have been partially offset by the increased apportionment generated by the additional days of operation. A savings in teachers' salaries has occurred due to the cost of a substitute being less than those teachers taking quarter leaves.

Health Services

Health services are provided at the school for three of the four quarters, which would be approximately 150 days of service. Even though this is less service than ordinarily provided for students, there is no real financial savings. There has been no need for additional health supplies.

Transportation, Operations, and Maintenance

Transportation has not been needed at Park School. Other youngsters are transported to the school at the expense of the parents.

There is no evidence of additional costs for the operation of the school plant. Custodians are normally employed on a year around basis, so no increase in salary is necessary. It has not been necessary to increase the custodial supply account. In that the school has always been used for summer school purposes prior to the year around schedule, there has been no increase in the cost of utilities.

Maintenance staff is employed on a year around basis so there has been no additional funding necessary for salaries of maintenance personnel. There is no evidence to indicate that the additional use of the school building has created maintenance problems. Maintenance work may be accomplished during the three-week vacations and in the late afternoon.

Fixed Costs, Food Services, and Community Services

The fixed cost related to employee health and welfare benefits has not been changed. All fixed services are currently scheduled on a year around basis.

Food service costs are offset by the price of lunches. There have been no additional costs incurred in the extended year for food services personnel.

It has not been necessary to increase the community services budget for the extended school year other than the minor cost of noon supervisors who are employed for one hour per day.

Summary

There appears to be no evidence to show that extending the school year, when compared with the cost of summer school, incurs budget problems. The effect of increasing the average daily attendance tends to offset much of the additional cost.

SUMMARY -- OTHER INFORMATION

Interviews with Business and Industrial Representatives

The Director of Research interviewed ten individuals representing seven of the industrial and business establishments in the Hayward community. The purpose of these interviews was to discuss the Park Plan and its effect upon their operation, especially vacation schedules and the over all concepts connected with the extended school year.

The following is a report of the results of these contacts:

- o The extended school year at Park had no noticeable effect upon the vacation schedules of the employees who have children at Park. The majority like the flexibility of vacation schedules, especially for the climate and vacation sites in California.
- o All the business and industrial representatives were aware of the program at Park. One individual commented, "Sure, I know about the Park Four-Quarter Plan -- it's been in the newspapers and the whole concept of the extended school year is receiving favorable publicity in many places."
- o These representatives considered the increased utilization of the school facilities as being one of the more important objectives of any extended year program. The concepts of individualizing instruction and the non-graded classroom organization were considered very important.
- o The concept of school accountability and a more realistic manner of school financing, was also stressed.
- o Two of the individuals contacted had visited Park School.

College and University Representatives

- o Twelve representatives of this group were contacted by the Director of Research concerning their general reaction to the extended and rescheduled school year. The following is a brief summary of these interviews and telephone contacts:
- o Ten of the twelve knew about the Park School four-quarter school year and its basic program. Three of the group had visited the school.

SUMMARY - OTHER INFORMATION (Continued)

College and University Representatives (Continued)

- o The basic objectives of the program were accepted by all of them. However, the concepts of non-graded, multi-age class groups and individualized instruction were considered the most important. The possibility of a more realistic summer student teaching program connected with the extended year also received a great deal of support.
- o One of the major concerns of the college - university group is embodied in the following comment from a respondent from Stanford University, "Just what is the commitment of other teachers outside the Park experiment to the extended and rescheduled school year? I don't think other teachers in your District and other places are really sold on the idea".
- o Another concern was the cost to support the need for expanded programs of inservice education to acquaint staff and community with all the many and varied aspects of any extended or rescheduled school year.
- o As a group, seventy-five percent (75%) favored the basic plan at Park and were generally highly complimentary of the efforts in this - "a right direction in meeting the true needs of children and youth".

A Continuing Longitudinal Study of Park Pupils

Beginning with the Park sixth grade class, school year 1968-69, a systematic study of the progress of these students is being followed as they proceed to Winton Junior High School and other schools. These students are now eighth graders at Winton Junior High School. Each year a new group will be added and will be studied as progress is made through the junior and senior high school. It is anticipated that approximately two hundred fifty (250) Park pupils will be included in this study.

Miss Pamela Walton, an elementary school teacher in the District and a graduate student at California State College at Hayward, is doing a research study concerning the follow-up of the Park 1969 sixth grade pupils. Some of her findings will be used in the Third Park Evaluation Report for the State Legislature in May, 1975. She is working closely with the District Office of Research, the Winton Junior High School staff, including the principal and counselor at this school, and the staff at Park School.

At this point, in looking toward the next evaluation report, District officials are formulating plans to seek some State or Federal funds to support the needed research for the continuing evaluation of the program. Other important aspects of the Park Plan, which calls for additional human and financial resources, are greatly needed.

CONCLUSIONS

Based upon an analysis of the data in this report, the following conclusions are presented:

Parent Support

- o The Park School parents continue to support the four-quarter year as organized at this school. Approximately eighty percent (80%) are supportive, while twenty percent (20%) disagree with the basic plan and some of its operational features.
- o Seventy-one percent (71%) rated the program as either outstanding or excellent, while twenty-four percent (24%) rated it as good. Only 5% rated the program below average as compared to other District programs.
- o The parents of Park pupils are asking more questions about the program than in previous surveys and questionnaires. They have a great deal of knowledge about its operation and question the general organization and operation of the school.
- o Twenty percent (20%) of the parents stress the need for more communication about the Park program from both the local school and District administration. This is shown by the reaction to Question #2, Parent Questionnaire, Part II, page 20, and also by a number of written comments presented by the parents. (See Part II, pages 19 to 25 for more details)

Pupil Support

- o Fifty-six percent (56%) of the pupils in grades four, five and six (190 pupils) rated the instructional program at Park as being excellent; twenty-four percent (24%) as good; sixteen percent (16%) as average and 4% below average.
- o Only twenty-three percent (23%) said they thought Park School should return to the regular ten month school year. Sixty-nine percent (69%) thought the program should continue and 8% were undecided. (See Part II, pages 26 to 28 for more details)

Park Teacher Support

- o The teachers at Park School are very supportive of the Park Extended Year Program and have been its most objective critics, and at the same time been its most active supporters. Eighty-two percent (82%) of this group rate the program as outstanding or excellent, while eighteen percent (18%) rate the program as good.
- o The written comments presented by this group and the recommendations made for improvement of the program show practical awareness of the organizational and operational features of the extended year program at Park. (See Part II, pages 2 to 12 for complete details))

CONCLUSIONS (Continued)

Non-Park K-6 Teacher Support

The K-6 teacher support for the Park program was not as high as that shown at Park School. Fifty-one (51%) were supportive while forty-nine percent (49%) disagreed with the basic plan or were undecided about the program. (See Part II, pages 13 to 15b for more details)

K-6 Principal Support

Thirty-two percent (32%) of the K-6 principals of the District rated the program as outstanding or excellent, while thirty-nine percent (39%) rated the program as good. Twenty-nine percent (29%) rated the program as average. The support given for the Park Plan was approximately the same for the group as in the November, 1969 survey. (See Part II, pages 16 to 18 for more details)

Achievement Test Results Grades 1, 2 and 3

- o The net reading gain made by Park pupils, Grade 1, May 1970, to Grade 3, May 1972, was twenty-nine (29) months progress as compared to the District net gain of twenty-six (26) months and twenty-seven (27) months progress for the Comparison Group.
- o Under the four-quarter extended school year, Park School is in session approximately twenty (20) additional days per year. This evaluation report covers a period of three years, thus there has been sixty (60) days or three months of additional instructional time. Based upon this premise, Park School at the primary level, Grades 1, 2 and 3, has maintained its reading achievement level as compared to the District and Comparison Group.
- o The Park net gain of an additional three months, over the District group at the primary level, would be the expected gain. Only two additional months gain was made above the Comparison Group. (See Table IV, V and VI, Part III, pages 5 to 7 for additional details)

Achievement Test Results Grades 4, 5 and 6

- o The net reading gain made by Park pupils, Grade 4 to 5, November 1970 and from Grade 5 to 6, October 1971, was twenty-two (22) months progress as compared to nineteen (19) months for the District and thirteen (13) months for the Comparison Group.
- o The net language gain made by the Park pupils, Grade 4 to 5, November 1970 and for Grade 5 to 6, October 1971, was twenty-two (22) months progress as compared to nineteen (19) months for the District and seventeen (17) months for the Comparison Group.
- o The arithmetic gain made by the Park pupils, Grade 4 to 5, November 1970 and from Grade 5 to 6, October 1971, was twenty (20) months progress as compared to the sixteen (16) months for the District and fifteen (15) months for the Comparison Group.

CONCLUSIONS (Continued)

Achievement Test Results Grades 4, 5 and 6 (Continued)

- o Forty (40) additional instructional days had been received by the Park pupils at the time of the November 1970 testing. This is equivalent to two months of instruction.
- o It is to be noted that in reading and language, the additional instructional time is reflected in two months of additional net gain. Twenty (20) months would be the normal growth expected. In arithmetic the net gains of an additional two months was not achieved.
- o In the October 1971 testing, Park pupils exceeded the net gains of both the District and the Comparison Group.
- o It is to be noted that Park pupils, October 1971, at the beginning of the sixth grade, received a total reading (grade equivalent) score of 6.3, total language 5.9 and total arithmetic 6.1. These scores were above the District and Comparison Group scores. (See Table III, Part III, page 4 for details)

Follow-up of Park Pupils - Test Results at Eighth Grade

A longitudinal study is being conducted of Park pupils as they proceed to the junior and senior high school. The 1969-70 sixth graders are now eighth grade pupils at Winton Junior High School. Fifty (50) pupils were tested in April, 1972 by using the District developed Minimum Standard Test in reading and mathematics. (See Table VII, Part II for additional details)

Vacation Schedule

Eighty-five percent (85%) of the Park parents thought there had been less loss of learning at Park because of the shorter vacation periods. Eleven percent (11%) were undecided about this while 4% disagreed.

Pupil Motivation

Seventy-one percent (71%) felt that their child had developed patterns of behavior, at Park, which brought greater self-motivation and direction.

Freedom at Park School

In response to the statement in the parent questionnaire, "There is too much freedom at Park School", fifty-seven percent (57%) of 202 respondents disagreed with the statement. Twenty-five percent (25%) accepted the statement, while eighteen percent (18%) were undecided.

Extension of the Four-Quarter Plan

- o Seventy-seven percent (77%) of the parents said they thought the Park Four-Quarter Plan should be extended to some of the junior high schools in the District. Only eleven percent (11%) indicated this shouldn't be done and twelve percent (12%) were undecided about this issue.

CONCLUSIONS (Continued)

Extension of the Four-Quarter Plan (Continued)

- o Sixty-two percent (62%) of the K-6 principals believe that the four-quarter program shouldn't be extended to all the elementary schools in the District. In the 1969 questionnaire-survey, fifty percent (50%) of this group indicated that this shouldn't be done; however at that time thirty-five percent (35%) were undecided about this issue. At present (May 1972) only 7% of the K-6 principals were undecided.

Objectives of the Park Program

The following question was presented to the Park parents, the teaching staff, K-6 principals, and a random sampling of K-6 teachers in the District. The ranking of the choices of the four groups are shown below:

"Listed below are some instructional concepts associated with the Park Four-Quarter Plan. Number in order of importance, i.e., 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5, those concepts which you believe best represent the operational objectives of this plan. Mark only five listings."

<u>Parents</u>	<u>Park Teachers</u>	<u>K-6 Principals</u>	<u>Non-Park K-6 Teachers</u>	
12	12	12	12	More opportunity for parent participation in school related activities
2	4	4	4	Self-motivating environment
7	2	3	2	Non-graded classroom
9	10	10	11	Better student-teacher-parent relationships
1	3	2	3	Less loss of learning because of shorter vacation periods
10	7	9	9	No grades and report cards
8	9	8	5	Greater opportunity for teacher planning
6	8	7	7	Greater efficiency in the use of instructional resources and facilities
5	6	6	10	Greater opportunity for students to develop self-discipline
4	1	1	1	Individualized instruction
3	5	5	8	Continuous progress
11	11	11	6	Full year employment of teachers

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based upon an analysis of the data in this report, the following recommendations are presented for consideration by the appropriate groups:

Extension of the Program

- o In the 1969 evaluation report of the Park program it was recommended that the basic design of the Park Four-Quarter Plan be extended to one of the ESEA Title I target schools. This was to be done to gain insight into the effect the extended school year might have upon children from disadvantaged backgrounds. At this writing, May 26, 1972, this goal of extending the four-quarter program to Sequoia, an ESEA Title I target school, is about to be achieved. Official word is being awaited from the California State Department of Education, Sacramento, California.
- o It is further recommended that the basic concept and organizational plan of the Park Extended Year be investigated by parents, students, local school staff, and District administration, for possible extension to Winton Junior High School. There seems to be some evidence from the Park teaching staff and parents of pupils who would be attending Winton, that their groups would be supportive of this extension. The Winton Junior High staff reaction to this type of program is unknown at this time.

Communication

It is recommended that Park School staff and the District Central Office Administrative staff continue their efforts for dissemination of periodic reports to the parents of Park School, the District K-6 teaching staff and administrative staff, and other interested parties. (It is to be noted that some preliminary work has been started to acquire possible federal funding for a "dissemination grant", for Park and Sequoia Schools.)

A Continual Follow-up of Park Pupils

It is recommended that the present follow-up study of the Park pupils be continued. The first group, now eighth grade pupils at Winton Junior High School, will continue on to Sunset High School for the school year 1972-73. It is further recommended that additional funds and resources be sought to finance the cost of this study.

Teacher Inservice Education

It is recommended that the Park School schedule be arranged so that additional opportunities for inservice education and planning activities be provided for the staff.

Assessment and Evaluation of the Program

- o One of the major problems encountered in the Park Four-Quarter evaluation activities, and for that matter any extended year program, is the difficulty encountered in obtaining a valid measurement of the quantitative educational effect of the increased learning time, and the even greater difficulty in arriving

RECOMMENDATIONS (Continued)

Assessment and Evaluation of the Program (Continued)

at a valid measurement of the non-cognitive effects of the program. Coupled with this is the valid measurement and assessment of the "loss of learning factor". Do pupils lose skill and concept mastery as a result of the three month vacation period in the summer? If so, how much, in what subject areas and under what conditions?

- o With these factors in mind, it is recommended that the District administration seek additional research funds (State or Federal) and the cooperation and resources of a graduate school of education in designing a research model to cope with the complex variables inherent in the problems defined above.

Program Costs

It is recommended that a detailed budgetary analysis be made of the Park Program costs as related to the approximately twenty (20) days of increased instructional time. Both direct and indirect cost variables accruing to the school should be analyzed. Savings which may be directly attributable to this program should be accountable as cost credits.

Meeting the Needs of the Park Pupils, Parents and Staff

Based upon the comments, observations and recommendations from the above groups, it is recommended that:

- o a study be made at Park of curriculum offerings in music, art and physical education.
- o a review and study be made of the present reporting system and parent conference activities.
- o a review be made of the present procedures related to the admission of pupils outside the Park attendance area into the program.
- o the possibility of a "swim center" at Park be pursued with the Hayward Recreation Department (HARD).
- o the possibility of acquiring more instructional space be considered.
- o additional secretarial time be given to the administration and staff at Park School.
- o there be more teacher involvement in the hiring of instructional aides.

WLS:sd:dp
May 31, 1972

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

CHAPTER 16. YEAR-AROUND ELEMENTARY SCHOOL OPERATION

(Article 1. General Provisions)

Legislative Intent

7495. It is the intent and purpose of the Legislature, by the provisions of this chapter, to authorize the establishment of an experimental four-quarter year-around elementary school program on a mandatory attendance basis at one elementary school maintained by a unified school district which has a current average daily attendance of not less than 25,000 nor more than 35,000. The program should enable the adoption of innovative instructional systems and techniques including special concentration upon critical elements of the required curricula over the longer academic year, permit maximum utilization of school plant, facilities and equipment, permit closer coordination of the elementary school instructional operations with the teacher-training operations of many institutions of higher education, permit the most efficient utilization of teachers' specializations, effect the replacement of the present system of lengthy summer vacations with shorter quarterly vacation periods with resultant diminution of pupils' vacation "learning loss," and afford numerous related benefits. This chapter shall be liberally construed to permit the accomplishment of these ends and to facilitate the complete evaluation of the school operations to enable the Legislature to determine what administrative, social, and other problems are presented thereby, and whether the same may feasibly be put into operation on a broader scale throughout the state. (Amended by Stats, 1970, Ch. 1040. Effective September 14, 1970.)

Experimental or Pilot Program

7495.2 A year-around elementary school program established pursuant to this chapter shall be of an experimental or pilot-program nature and shall have a duration of seven full academic years, established by the governing board of the district for purposes of the program. (Amended by Stats, 1970, Ch. 1040. Effective September 14, 1970.)

(Article 4. Testing and Reports)

Comprehensive Report

7495.32 The governing board of the school district shall keep a continuous record of the progress of each pupil, and within 30 calendar days after the commencement of the regular session of the Legislature convened following the expiration of the third, fifth, and seventh academic years during which an educational program established pursuant to this chapter is in operation at a school shall, acting through and in conjunction with the Department of Education, submit to the Legislature a comprehensive report concerning the program. The report shall contain information concerning the results of the testing program conducted pursuant to Section 7495.31, of the administrative and fiscal problems connected with the program, the impact of the program upon the community and its acceptance by citizens, parent, and taxpayers, and all other relevant matters.

(Amended by Stats, 1970, Ch. 1040. Effective September 14, 1970.)

HAYWARD UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
Division of Educational Services
Department of Elementary Education

PARK SCHOOL FOUR-QUARTER PLAN CALENDAR 1971-1972

	M	T	W	Th	F		M	T	W	Th	F	
July 1971	~~5~~	⑥	7	8	9	19	January 1972	③	4	5	6	7
	12	13	14	15	16			10	11	12	13	14
	19	20	21	22	23			17	18	19	20	21
	26	27	28	29	30			24	25	26	27	28
								31				21
August	2	3	4	5	6	47	February		1	2	3	4
	9	10	11	12	13			7	8	9	10	~~11~~
	16	17	18	19	20			14	15	16	17	18
	23	24	25	26	27			~~21~~	22	23	24	25
	30	31						28	29			19
September	~~6~~	7	8	~~9~~	⑩	6	March			1	2	3
	13	14	15	16	17			6	7	8	9	~~10~~
	20	21	22	23	24			13	14	15	16	17
	27	28	29	30				20	21	22	23	24
								~~27~~	28	29	30	31
October	④	5	6	7	8	19	April	③	4	5	6	7
	11	12	13	14	15			10	11	12	13	14
	18	19	20	21	22			17	18	19	20	21
	~~25~~	26	27	28	29			24	25	26	27	28
												20
November	1	2	3	4	5	47	May	1	2	3	4	5
	8	9	10	11	12			8	9	10	11	12
	15	16	17	18	19			15	16	17	18	19
	22	23	24	~~25~~	~~26~~			22	23	24	25	26
	29	30						~~29~~	30	31		22
December			1	2	3	8	June				1	2
	6	7	8	9	~~10~~			5	6	7	8	9
	13	14	15	16	17			12	13	14	15	~~16~~
	20	21	22	23	24			19	20	21	22	23
	27	28	29	30	31			26	27	28	29	30

○ Quarter begins

× Quarter ends

≡ Holidays

Total Teacher Work Days 205

Total Teaching Days 196

APPENDIX C

SELECTED ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS TO SERVE AS COMPARISON GROUPS for PARK SCHOOL EVALUATION REPORT *

<u>1969-70</u> <u>Group I</u>	<u>1970-71</u> <u>Group II</u>	<u>1971-72</u> <u>Group III</u>	<u>Group III</u> <u>Enroll-</u> <u>ment 4/'72</u>
Bidwell	Baywood	Baywood	488
Brenkwitz	Brenkwitz	Brenkwitz	413
Eden Gardens	Laurel	Cherryland	534
Eldridge	Eldridge	East Avenue	320
Gansberger	Glassbrook	Eden Gardens	471
Harder	Lorin Eden	Glassbrook	358
Markham	Park	Laurel	259
Mohrland	Treeview	Lorin Eden	509
Park		Muir	466
Shepherd		Park	442
Tennyson		Schafer Park	521
Treeview		Sorensen	251
Winton Grove		Southgate	503
		Tennyson Elem.	353
		Treeview	396
		Winton Grove	272
<u>Total 13 Schools</u>	<u>Total 8 Schools</u>	<u>Total 16 Schools</u>	

*Schools selected on the basis of having approximately the same scholastic aptitude scores (I.Q.) as Park School for the fall testing 1969, 1970, and 1971. It is also to be noted that there is a high positive correlation among the factors of group I.Q. scores, high percentage of AFDC families (Aid For Dependent Children) free lunch participation, scores received on standardized achievement tests, and general socio-economic level of the school attendance area.

Group I

The scholastic aptitude scores for the comparison group represented a range of median school scores from 97 to 101. Park School median scholastic aptitude score for November 1969 was 100. The District median was 97.

Group II

The median school score for the comparison group represented a range of median scores from 96 to 98. Park School median score for November 1970 was 96. The median District score was 99.

Group III

The scholastic aptitude scores for the comparison schools represented a range of median school scores from 98 to 101. Park School median scholastic aptitude score for October, 1971 was 100. The District score was 96.

APPENDIX D

CERTIFICATED AND CLASSIFIED STAFF AT PARK SCHOOL for the School Years 1967-68 to 1971-72

<u>Principal</u>	<u>1967-68</u>	<u>1968-69</u>	<u>1969-70</u>	<u>1970-71</u>	<u>1971-72</u>
Bernard Moura	X	X	X	X	X
<u>Teachers</u>					
Barnes, Bonnie	X	X	X	X	X
Bates, Vera	X	X	X	X	X
Beverett, Cheryl					X
Black, Gail	X				
Brandt, Karen	X	X	X	X	Left Park, Spring '72
Buchanan, Carol	X				
Carter, Phil		X	X		
Cavanaugh, William	X				
Chavez, Geneva	X	X			
Clausen, Sally		X	X		
Davis, Tom					X
Eschen, Mary Jane	X	X	X	X	X
Fagan, Kay		X			
Finnegan, Betty		X	X	X	X
Gardner, Bonnie		X			
Heard, Jane			X		
Kvalnes, Betty	X				
LaRue, Sidney					Started at Park Spring, 1972
Laird, Stanley		X	X	X	X
Logan, Nancy			X	X	X
Logsdon, Bonnie	X	X	X	X	X
Maashoff, Arline	X	X			
McGurk, Mary	X	X	X	X	X
Pelton, Jill	X				
Robertson, Sue		X			
Timens, Carol	X				
Townsley, Beverly		X	X	X	X
Tucker, Judith				X	X
Walker, Sharon			X		
Wands, Elnora					X
Young, Diane				X	

APPENDIX D (Continued)

<u>Classified Staff</u>	<u>1967-68</u>	<u>1968-69</u>	<u>1969-70</u>	<u>1970-71</u>	<u>1971-72</u>
Anderson Claudia, Staff Secretary I	X	X			
Anderson, Majoria, Instructional Aide			X	Fall '71	
Bricker, Barbara, Instructional Aide				X	X
Burlington, Leonard, Custodian	X	X	X	X	X
Crankshaw, Joyce, Clerk Typist			X		
Elliott, Frances, Instructional Aide				X	X
Ford, Ethel, Instructional Aide			X		
Franke, Ericka, Instructional Aide			X		
Helmes, Eve, Cafeteria				X	X
Hilliard, Janis, Instructional Aide					X
Hosford, Edna, Cafeteria	X	X	X	X	X
Howard, Kathleen, Instructional Aide					X
Kain, Elmer, Custodian	X	X	X	X	
Mein, Marcia, Instructional Aide			X		
Melville, Lois, Instructional Aide			X	X	X
Oxenford, Bill, Custodian					X
Patton, Marie, School Secretary I	X	X	X	X	X
Seibert, Hazel, Cafeteria	X	X	X		
Urioste, Starlene, Instructional Aide				X	